

Transmittal Email to the Clerk of the Supreme Court of The United States

10/27/2026

Dear Mr. Harris:

I am transmitting the enclosed material because it addresses the constitutional consequences that Petitioners contend will follow if the pending Petition for Rehearing is denied without resolution of the no-remedy question presented in No. 26-179.

I very respectfully request that this correspondence and enclosure be placed through whatever internal process is appropriate for materials relating to a pending rehearing matter, or that your Office advise me promptly if the Court's Rules do not permit such submission or distribution.

I am not asking the Clerk to advocate a position, alter the Court's procedures, or take any action inconsistent with the Court's Rules. I am asking only that the record reflect that the constitutional and institutional consequences have been expressly presented while the rehearing matter remains pending.

The urgency of this request is not based upon disagreement with an adverse judicial result. It arises from the consequence Petitioners have repeatedly identified: asserted federal constitutional rights have proceeded through successive tribunals without receiving a merits adjudication from a tribunal capable of granting the relief sought.

Petitioners are attempting, while the Rule 44.2 rehearing matter remains pending, to ensure that the Court understands the institutional consequence alleged to follow if that procedural condition remains unresolved.

The concern is larger than the underlying property dispute. The record presented to governmental authorities alleges substantial property-tax, tax-base, and related public-debt irregularities, while the constitutional question presented to this Court concerns whether citizens can obtain meaningful adjudication of federal rights when the designated administrative process cannot supply the requested relief.

The identifiable risks are loss of access to constitutional remedies, replication of the no-remedy architecture, loss of public confidence in judicial institutions, continued unresolved financial allegations, and potential systemic consequences if the underlying tax-base evidence proves correct.

If Petitioners are wrong, adjudication can identify the error.

If Petitioners are correct, continued non-adjudication leaves both the alleged governmental conduct and the constitutional no-remedy problem unresolved.

For that reason, time matters and time is of the essence.

I respectfully request procedural guidance from the Clerk's Office as to the proper method, if any, by which the enclosed notice may be brought to the attention of the Court or otherwise associated with No. 26-179 while the Petition for Rehearing remains pending. I am not asking the Clerk to advocate for Petitioners, depart from the Court's Rules, or communicate anything beyond what Court procedure permits.

I am asking how, within those Rules, Petitioners can ensure that the Court has been expressly placed on notice of the constitutional and institutional consequences they contend may follow before the Court's remaining opportunity to reconsider the matter has passed.

One question I believe any reader of the enclosed *SCOTUS Has Fallen* should ask is straightforward: **Is there any material factual statement in this document that is incorrect, and if so, what is it?**

Respectfully,

Mitchell Vexler
Petitioner, Pro Se
Designated Correspondence Contact
Supreme Court No. 26-179
mitch@mockingbirdprop.com

1913 Justin Road
Suite 117
Flower Mound, TX.
75028
214-725-9013
mitch@mockingbirdprop.com
www.mockingbirdproperties.com/dcad