

Medicare Summary Notice

November 10, 2011

CUSTOMER SERVICE INFORMATIONYour Medicare Number: XXX-XX-~~45824~~If you have questions, call 1-800-Medicare
(1-800-633-4227) (#01001)Ask for Hospital Services
TTY for Hearing Impaired: 1-877-486-2048KAMAL B. MAHDAVI
P O BOX 121164
SAN DIEGO CA 92112-1164**BE INFORMED:** Read your Medicare Summary Notice carefully for accuracy of dates, services, and amounts billed to Medicare.

This is a summary of claims processed on 09/12/2011.

PART A HOSPITAL INSURANCE - INPATIENT CLAIMS

Dates of Service	Benefit Days Used	Non-Covered Charges	Deductible and Coinsurance	You May Be Billed	See Notes Section
Control number 21125101903302CAA Prime Healthcare Paradise Valle 2400e 4th St National City, CA 91950-2026 Referred by: Samuel Kugel 01/19/11-01/20/11					a,b
	1 days	\$0.00	\$1,132.00	\$1,132.00	c,d

Notes Section:

- a What Medicare pays for a service or item may be higher than the billed amount. The Medicare payment amount is correct. Medicare pays this provider less than the billed amount on other claims since payment rates are set in advance for certain services and averaged out over an entire year.
- b The amount Medicare paid the provider for this claim is \$7,010.96.
- c Days are being subtracted from your total inpatient hospital benefits for this benefit period.
- d \$1,132.00 was applied to your inpatient deductible.

THIS IS NOT A BILL - Keep this notice for your records.*the attachment*

The Attachment 2

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

ALEX KOZINSKI
CHIEF JUDGE

(626) 229-7140
FAX: 229-7444
alex@kozinski.com

October 17, 2011

Dear Mr. Mahdavi:

I have received your various communications, including your latest letter dated October 7, 2011. No one has interfered with your communications to me.

You complain that deputy clerks have rendered a decision in your Mandamus Petition, No. 10-73928. But a check of the docket sheet discloses that the order dismissing the petition was authored by three judges of our court. I attach a copy of that order. That case is now over and there is nothing to be done about it.

Please do not write to me about this again. If you do, I will not answer.

Sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'AK' with a long horizontal stroke underneath.

125 SOUTH GRAND AVENUE • PASADENA • CALIFORNIA 91105

The Attachment
3.1.11

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAR 15 2011

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

In re: KAMAL B. MAHDAVI.

No. 10-73928

KAMAL B. MAHDAVI,

D.C. No. 3:10-cv-02495-JLS
Southern District of California,
San Diego

Petitioner,

v.

ORDER

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO,

Respondent,

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL
SECURITY,

Real Party in Interest.

Before: LEAVY, TASHIMA, and BYBEE, Circuit Judges.

Petitioner has not demonstrated that this case warrants the intervention of this court by means of the extraordinary remedy of mandamus. *See Bauman v. United States Dist. Court*, 557 F.2d 650 (9th Cir. 1977). Accordingly, the petition is denied.

The motion to proceed in forma pauperis is denied as moot.

SL/MOATT

The Attachment 3
P.2

No motions for reconsideration, rehearing, clarification, or any other
submissions shall be filed or entertained in this closed docket.

Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division One - No. D060585

S197044

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA

En Banc

KAMAL B. MAHDAVI, Petitioner,

v.

SUPERIOR COURT OF SAN DIEGO COUNTY, Respondent;

THE PEOPLE et al., Real Parties in Interest.

The petition for review is denied.

SUPREME COURT
FILED

NOV 16 2011

Frederick K. Ohlrich Clerk

Deputy

CANTIL-SAKAUYE

Chief Justice

The Attachment 4

COURT OF APPEAL - STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

KAMAL B. MAHDAVI,

Petitioner,

v.

THE SUPERIOR COURT OF SAN DIEGO COUNTY,

Respondent;

PARKSIDE INN, et al.,


Real Parties in Interest.

San Diego County No. 37-2011-00100687-CU-PT-CTL

Court of Appeal Fourth District
FILED
NOV 14 2011
Stephen M. Kelly, Clerk
DEPUTY

THE COURT:

Request for Permission to File Writ Petition received by this court on November 9, 2011, is DENIED. (Code of Civ. Proc. sec. 391.7, subd. (b).) The request to waive court fees is DENIED as moot. The clerk is directed to keep one copy of the writ petition for this court's records. The additional copies, original petition and exhibits are to be returned to Mr. Mahdavi.


Presiding Justice

The Attachment
5

COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT
DIVISION 1

KAMAL B. MAHDAVI,

Petitioner,

v.

THE SUPERIOR COURT OF SAN DIEGO COUNTY,

Respondent;

PARKSIDE INN, et al.

Real Party in Interest.

CASE NUMBER:	D060919
NOA/PET DATE:	11/09/2011
STATUS:	active
PRIORITY:	high
CAUSE:	Original Proceeding
CASE TYPE:	Civil
DISPO DATE:	
FINAL DISP:	
ORIGIN:	Superior
CATEGORY:	opot Original proceeding - other

OLD CASE NUMBER (S):

TRIAL COURT INFORMATION

Case No.:	37-2011-00100687-CU-PT-CTL
County:	San Diego
Court:	San Diego County Superior Court - Main
Judge:	
Jud. Date:	

ATTORNEY - PARTY

In propria persona

Petitioner

Case Information as of November 21, 2011

The Attachment
6

COURT OF APPEAL - STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

Court of Appeal Fourth District

FILED

NOV 22 2011

Stephan M. Kelly, Clerk

DEPUTY

KAMAL B. MAHDAVI,

Petitioner,

v.

THE SUPERIOR COURT OF SAN DIEGO COUNTY,

Respondent;

PARKSIDE INN et al.,


Real Parties in Interest.

D060919

San Diego County No. 37-2011-00100687-CU-PT-CTL

THE COURT:

Petitioner Kamal B. Mahdavi's ex parte motion to vacate this court's November 14, 2011, order is DENIED.



Acting Presiding Justice

cc: All Parties

The Attachment
17

APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION TO APPEAL OR
TO FILE WRIT PETITION

Code of Civil Procedure section 391.7

Court of Appeal Fourth District
RECEIVED

NOV 09 2011

Stephen M. Kelly, Clerk

DEPUTY

Administrative Presiding Justice

COURT OF APPEAL, FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

750 "B" Street, Suite 300

San Diego, CA 92101

Application Deadline

Name of Appellant/Petitioner: Kamal B. Mahdavi

Name of Opposing Party(s) The S.D. - City Superior Ct.

Court of Appeal Number, if assigned Division !

Superior Court County

Date of Judgment/Orders(s) Challenged The 7th of Nov. 11

Statute Authorizing Appeal: ☐ CCP 904.1

☒ Other petition for the writ of mandate.

IN THREE PAGES OR LESS

(1) Describe the nature of the superior court action and judgment or order under review

(continue on a separate page):

In the violation of the law that a person found to be a vexatious litigant must receive the court order requiring him or her to request for the pre-filing order when he, or she, intends to file (cont. on P. 2, No. 1)

(2) Explain why the appeal/writ petition has merit (continue on a separate page):

The decisional law says that a writ of mandate to compel the exercise of the discretion in a particular manner by a court lies when the (cont. on P. 2, No. 2)

I declare under penalty of perjury that the information I have provided on this form is true and (1) I believe that my appeal or writ petition has merit and (2) I am not seeking to file it for purposes of harassment or delay.

The 9th of Nov. 11
Date Signed

K. B. Mahdavi
Signature

The Attachment
8, P. 1

1. the new litigation, the superior c.t., on the political grounds, forced me, who have neither been found by the superior c.t. to be a vexatious litigant nor received the court order, that I must apply for the profiling order, to file the request for the profiling order on the 7th of Nov. 2011. -- see the Petition for the Peremptory Mandamus writ, P. 2, the last paragraph. the absence of the order that I should apply for the profiling order also applies to the court of appeals, and I request the clarification of this matter and a hearing, because I am harassed whenever I come to the office of the clerk.

2. facts support only one decision -- Nathanson v. the Superior Ct., 125 3d 355, 361 (1974); see also the Petition for the Peremptory Mandamus writ, P. 4. the petitioner, in the specified petition has demonstrated that the facts written in the complaint numbered 37-2011-00100687-C4-PT-CTL support only one decision -- see the Petition for the Peremptory Mandamus writ, P. 4, the last paragraph to P. 7, line 10.

THE 14th, 8, P. 2