

No. _____

**In The
Supreme Court of the United States**

STARSHA M. SEWELL,

Petitioner,

v.

FIDELITY NATIONAL FINANCIAL, INC.,

Respondent.

**On Petition For Writ Of Certiorari
To The United States Court Of Appeals
For The Fourth Circuit**

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
REGARDING ECONOMIC ESPIONAGE OF THE
MARYLAND MORTGAGE TASK FORCE, DHS & FBI
PARTNERS OF THE RESPONDENT & DOMESTIC
TREASONIST AGAINST THE UNITED STATES OF
AMERICA IN VIOLATION OF EXECUTIVE ORDERS
13519 AND 13772 & SARBANES OXLEY
CONCEALMENT OF A PONZI SCHEME
PURCHASED BY FIDELITY NATIONAL FINANCIAL
WITH MALICIOUS INTENT TO DEFRAUD THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA UNDER THE
LEADERSHIP OF ROBERT MUELLER IN 2006,
AND JAMES COMEY IN 2014; IMPLEMENTED
UNDER CHRIS WRAY AS FORMER EXECUTIVE
DIRECTOR RICHARD A. MCFEELY & JOSEPH S.
CAMPBELL USED IC3 TO ORCHESTRATE
A PARENTAL ABDUCTION OF MY SONS ON
MARCH 7, 2014, ONE MONTH PRIOR TO HIS
RETIREMENT USING THE MARYLAND
MORTGAGE TASK FORCE & ICE, DHS IN
VIOLATION OF FEDERAL ORDERS ISSUED
BY THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

STARSHA M. SEWELL, CSM, M.Ed.
P.O. Box 7073
Capitol Heights, MD 20791
240-621-2782

RECEIVED

AUG 20 2018

**OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.**

QUESTIONS PRESENTED – Continued

the Maryland Mortgage Task Force, all who concealed Fidelity National Financial implementation of a Ponzi Scheme against the United States of America and Its Insured?

4. Whether Judge Grimm deprived the Appellant of leave to re-open a case to engage in 18 U.S.C. § 1519 Sarbanes Oxley Concealment of his use of the prestige of his position to advance the interest of Fidelity National Financial, who purchased a Ponzi scheme and defrauded the Appellant out of policy coverage in violation of her contract of homeowners insurance, post-policy coverages, which were concealed by Judge Grimm & Bredar with the sole intent to permit the Appellee to breached the Appellant's contract in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1981, due to racial bias and whistleblower reprisal?
5. Whether Judge Grimm & Bredar utilized the injunction that Judge Chasanow filed against the Appellant to conceal Fidelity National Financial, purchase and implementation of a Ponzi Scheme against the United States of America and their insured on January 12, 2018 to engage in 18 U.S.C. § 242 Civil Rights Deprivations due to racial bias and whistleblower reprisal; and to advance the interest of Laurence Silberman who used the Maryland Mortgage Task Force created by Rod Rosenstein, which falsely presented itself as a Member of President Obama's Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, and Used the work group to conceal the Ponzi Scheme of Fidelity National Financial In violation of Executive Order 13271

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING

The parties to the proceeding below were the Petitioner Starsha M. Sewell, and Fidelity National Financial, Inc., which is a corporate party requiring a disclosure statement under Supreme Court Rule 29.6.

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Continued

	Page
I. STATE, FEDERAL DISTRICT, AND FEDERAL CIRCUIT COURTS IN THE FOURTH CIRCUIT ARE VIOLATING PRECEDENT ESTABLISHED BY THE U.S. SUPREME COURT AND THEIR JUDICIAL BEHAVIOR IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL. THE PATTERNS AND PRACTICES THAT THESE COURTS PROVIDES DIRECT EVIDENCE OF THEIR INTENTION TO ENGAGE IN ECONOMIC ESPIONAGE AND WHISTLE-BLOWER REPRISAL, BECAUSE THEY HAD A VESTED INTEREST IN CONCEALING MONEY LAUNDERING USING THE MEMBERS OF THE MARYLAND MORTGAGE TASK FORCE, WHICH BREACHED EXECUTIVE ORDERS 13519 AND 13772....	26
CONCLUSION.....	26

APPENDIX

Appendix A: Order and Opinion, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit filed April 10, 2018	App. 1
Appendix B: Finding and Conclusion of the U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland, filed December 14, 2017.....	App. 3
Appendix C: Rehearing Denied, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, filed May 8, 2018	App. 7
Appendix D: Mandate, US Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, filed May 16, 2018.....	App. 8

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
CASES:	
<i>Hadden v. Rumsey Products</i> , 96 F.Supp. 988 (W.D.N.Y. 1951).....	26
<i>Owen v. City of Independence</i> , 445 U.S. 622 (1980).....	24, 27
<i>Pumphrey v. K. W. Thompson Tool Co.</i> , 62 F.3d 1128 (9th Cir. 1995).....	25
<i>Russell v. Delco Remy Div. of Gen. Motors Corp.</i> , 51 F.3d 746 (7th Cir. 1995).....	28
<i>Yates v. United States</i> , 574 U.S. __ (2015)	24
CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS	
U.S. Const. Amend. I.....	2, 26
U.S. Const. Amend. V.....	2, 26
U.S. Const. Amend. IX	4, 5, 26
U.S. Const. Amend. XIII	5, 28
U.S. Const. Amend. XIV.....	6, 26, 28
STATUTES	
Executive Order 13519.....	14, 26
Executive Order 13772.....	14, 26
18 U.S.C. § 242	7, 16, 23, 27
18 U.S.C. § 1519	<i>passim</i>
18 U.S.C. § 2382	8, 13, 14
42 U.S.C. § 1981	9

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner Starsha M. Sewell, respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the United States court of appeals Enbanc is unpublished and reprinted at Petition for Writ of Certiorari Appendix (“App”) appears at Appendix C to the petition and is Unpublished.

The opinion of the United States District Court appears at Appendix B to the petition and is reported at PACER.

JURISDICTION

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided on my case was **April 4, 2018** marked herein as Appendix A.

A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: April 17, 2018 Appendix C. The Order that the Petitioner seeks review of is dated for **May 8, 2018** the Mandate for this order went into effect on **May 16, 2018** and is attached to the petition as Appendix D.

promise an assurance that all levels of American government must operate within the law (“legality”) and provide fair procedures. Most of this essay concerns that promise. We should briefly note, however, three other uses that these words have had in American constitutional law.

Incorporation

The Fifth Amendment’s reference to “due process” is only one of many promises of protection the *Bill of Rights* gives citizens against the federal government. Originally these promises had no application at all against the states (see *Barron v. City of Baltimore* (1833)). However, this attitude faded in *Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company v. City of Chicago* (1897), when the court incorporated the Fifth Amendment’s Takings Clause. In the middle of the Twentieth Century, a series of Supreme Court decisions found that the Due Process Clause “incorporated” most of the important elements of the Bill of Rights and made them applicable to the states. If a Bill of Rights guarantee is “incorporated” in the “due process” requirement of the Fourteenth Amendment, state and federal obligations are exactly the same.

Substantive due process

The words “due process” suggest a concern with procedure rather than substance, and that is how many – such as Justice Clarence Thomas, *who wrote “the Fourteenth Amendment’s Due Process Clause is not*

“The language and history of the Ninth Amendment reveal that the Framers of the Constitution believed that there are additional fundamental rights, protected from governmental infringement, which exist alongside those fundamental rights specifically mentioned in the first eight constitutional amendments. . . . To hold that a right so basic and fundamental and so deep-rooted in our society as the right of privacy in marriage may be infringed because that right is not guaranteed in so many words by the first eight amendments to the Constitution is to ignore the Ninth [p.1505] Amendment and to give it no effect whatsoever. Moreover, a judicial construction that this fundamental right is not protected by the Constitution because it is not mentioned in explicit terms by one of the first eight amendments or elsewhere in the Constitution would violate the Ninth Amendment. . . . Nor do I mean to state that the Ninth Amendment constitutes an independent source of right protected from infringement by either the States or the Federal Government. Rather, the Ninth Amendment shows a belief of the Constitution’s authors that fundamental rights exist that are not expressly enumerated in the first eight amendments and an intent that the list of rights included there not be deemed exhaustive.”

U.S. Const. Amend. XIII-Section 1.

Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

Whoever knowingly alters, destroys, mutilates, conceals, covers up, falsifies, or makes a false entry in any *record*, document, or tangible object with the intent to impede, obstruct, or influence the investigation or proper administration of any matter within the jurisdiction of any *department* or agency of the *United States* or any case filed under title 11, or in relation to or contemplation of any such matter or case, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both.

(Added *Pub. L. 107-204, title VIII, § 802(a)*, July 30, 2002, *116 Stat. 800*.)

18 U.S.C. § 242.....1-22

Whoever, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, willfully subjects any *person* in any State, Territory, Commonwealth, Possession, or District to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the *United States*, or to different punishments, pains, or penalties, on account of such person being an alien, or by reason of his color, or race, than are prescribed for the punishment of citizens, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and if bodily injury results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include the use, attempted use, or threatened use of a dangerous weapon, explosives, or fire, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both; and if death results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such

Territory or the District of Columbia, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other *person* within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress, except that in any action brought against a judicial officer for an act or omission taken in such officer's judicial capacity, injunctive relief shall not be granted unless a declaratory decree was violated or declaratory relief was unavailable. For the purposes of this section, any Act of Congress applicable exclusively to the District of Columbia shall be considered to be a statute of the District of Columbia.

(R.S. § 1979; *Pub. L. 96-170*, § 1, Dec. 29, 1979, 93 *Stat. 1284*; *Pub. L. 104-317*, title III, § 309(c), Oct. 19, 1996, 110 *Stat. 3853*.)

42 U.S.C. § 1981.....

(a) STATEMENT OF EQUAL RIGHTS

All *persons* within the jurisdiction of the United States shall have the same right in every State and Territory to *make and enforce contracts*, to sue, be parties, give evidence, and to the full and equal benefit of all laws and proceedings for the security of persons and property as is enjoyed by white citizens, and shall be subject to like punishment, pains, penalties, taxes, licenses, and exactions of every kind, and to no other.

conspiring to commit such an offense. Sets forth provisions regarding criminal forfeiture, civil proceedings to enjoin violations, conduct outside the United States, and non-preemption of other remedies under Federal, State, commonwealth, possession, or territory law.

On December 28, 2012, President Obama signed into law the Theft of Trade Secrets Clarification Act. The Act amends the Economic Espionage Act of 1996 (EEA) and expands the jurisdiction of federal courts over cases concerning misappropriation of trade secrets. It was enacted in response to a recent Second Circuit decision that arguably narrowed the jurisdictional scope of the Economic Espionage Act of 1996.

The passage of the EEA (18 U.S.C. §§ 1831-39) marked the first major federal legislation aimed specifically at granting federal courts jurisdiction over claims of trade secret misappropriation. With the enactment of the EEA, Congress gave federal prosecutors a vehicle to bring criminal charges against individuals who knowingly misappropriate trade secrets. 18 U.S.C. § 1832(a). The EEA also provided the federal government the ability to seek injunctive relief for trade secret theft in a civil action under the statute. *Id.* § 1836.

Prior to the EEA, trade secrets were the subject of state law protections, largely under state-adopted versions of the Uniform Trade Secrets Act. Under that regime, federal courts obtained jurisdiction over such claims solely by means of diversity jurisdiction or through charges under federal criminal statutes stretched to cover trade secret misappropriation.

Senator Patrick Leahy, the sponsor of the bill, the new language would encompass trade secrets like Goldman's internal source code, which, though not for sale, "was part of a financial trading system that was used in interstate commerce every day." Cong. Rec. S6978 (daily ed. Nov. 27, 2012).

The Theft of Trade Secrets Clarification Act standing alone is significant. That it was enacted in a political era marked by partisanship and the "fiscal cliff" by a lame-duck Congress during a holiday consumed by fiscal cliff negotiations makes it all the more remarkable. These circumstances underscore the federal government's continued commitment to protecting the intellectual property of U.S. businesses and entrepreneurs.

Fed. R. Civ. Pro. Rule 60(b)

Fed. R. Civ. Pro. Rule 59(e)



STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Comes now, Starsha Sewell, M.Ed., showing that the United States Court of Appeals are engaging in 18 U.S.C. § 2382 Misprision Treason, and Economic Espionage against the United States of America. The petitioner who is *Insider Threat* certified by the *United States of America Defense Security Service* to report *Insider threats*, respectfully submitted a complaint to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit who has a fact pattern of ignoring the Petitioner's 18

insured and to engage in financial crimes against the United States of America, therefore causing a Major Deficit and abuse of Congressional and Presidential Appropriations that was issued from the Federal Reserve to make this Nation whole.

On Or about December of 2016, The Federal Reserve issued a \$65 million fine to Fidelity National Financial for implementing and concealing a Ponzi Scheme, from 2014 to the Present the Appellant has engaged in litigation to have this company held accountable for their financial crimes against her, the orchestration of the theft of her property, the arranging of the kidnapping of her sons from State Court Judge John P. Davey in violation of orders from this court, and the use of their Human Resources influence and partnership with the Financial Crimes enforcement network, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to conceal their financial crimes against the United States.

Upon filing disclosures and cases against the said entity, this court has engaged in retaliatory discrimination, specifically civil rights deprivations, in violation of the 13th and 14th Amendments of the United States Constitution. 18 U.S.C. § 1519 and the Espionage Act of 1964.

The U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland and The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit have willfully failed to be independent fact finders in matters involving The Respondent from 2013 to the present, and it is my good faith belief that all have

(Petitioner) with the intent to indefinitely engage in 18 U.S.C. § 1519 concealment of the Ponzi Scheme to advance the interest of Fidelity National Financial and Strayer University, who recently joined forces with the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (ICE) and the Federal Bureau of Investigations to create law enforcement trainings in South Carolina under the Capella University Umbrella, just as was reported to the Office of Inspector General at the United States Treasury, who took no action from 2014 to the Present. However, the Federal Reserve's Board of Governors did, as they fined the Organization \$65 Million, but are owed much more.

“Training for Immigration and Customs Enforcement Agents

In FY2010, nearly 4,000 ICE employees were trained in more than 30 training programs.

Training is a major component of any Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) agent's career, as is evident by the new ICE Academy Complex at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC) in Glynco, Georgia.

The ICE Academy Complex, which was opened in late 2011, was created specifically for the training and preparation of ICE's special agents and officers who enforce the country's immigration and customs laws.

Sponsored School

Capella University is proud to be partnered with the FBI National Academy Associates (FBINAA).

All new hires of ICE are required to attend 22 weeks of basic training at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC) in Glynco, Georgia. The formal FLETC training program involves basic technical instructions that must be completed to continue as an ICE agent. Trainees are also expected to undergo regular physical fitness assessments during training.

The basic training programs for new ICE hires include:

ICE Training School Program: Criminal Investigator Training Program (CITP)

The Criminal Investigator Training Program (CITP), a 56-day program, provides training in the concepts and techniques of conducting criminal investigations, which includes lecture, practical exercises, laboratories and exams. Trainees within the program participate in small task force teams involved in a continuing case investigation. The task force teams: interview witnesses; perform surveillance and undercover operation; develop cases; write and execute search and arrest warrants; write criminal complaints; testify in a courtroom hearing; and obtain an indictment. All trainees in the CITP receive mentoring by a Continuing Case Investigation Coordinator.

Training topics in the CITP include:

- *Criminal case management*
- *Firearms*
- *Interviewing*

The FAD offers 8 advanced firearms training programs and more than 100 firearms courses, many of which are within the FLETC's basic and advanced law enforcement training programs.

ICE Training School Program: Immigration and Customs Enforcement Deportation Integrated (ICED)

The Immigration and Customs Enforcement Deportation Integrated (ICED) program (formerly called the Immigration Officer Basic Training Course), a 63-day program, is designed for new ICE Immigration Enforcement Agency (IEA). Topics within the ICED program include:

- *Detention procedures*
- *Immigration and naturalization laws*
- *Fingerprinting*
- *Defensive tactics*
- *Arrest techniques*
- *Baton techniques*
- *Officer liability*
- *Firearms handling and qualification*
- *Driver techniques*

About the Office of Training and Development

The ICE Office of Training and Development is responsible for establishing and maintaining standards for all ICE training programs. It also ensures the

ARGUMENT

I. THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT HAS A FACT PATTERN OF ENGAGING IN WHISTLEBLOWER REPRISAL AGAINST THE PETITIONER & SARBANES OXLEY CONCEALMENT OF THE MARYLAND MORTGAGE TASK FORCE'S ECONOMIC ESPIONAGE AGAINST THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA VIA ITS CONCEALMENT OF THE RESPONDENT'S PURCHASE OF A PONZI SCHEME, AND IMPLEMENTATION AGAINST THE PETITIONER, ET AL.

The U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland and the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit has engaged in 18 U.S.C. § 242 Civil rights deprivations against the Petitioner in every case that she, with malicious intent to violate the Petitioners constitutional rights to due process and Civil Liberties, simply because they have a vested interest in concealing a Ponzi scheme that onset the Housing Crisis of 2008.

The lower courts clearly convey their intent to also obstruct justice in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1519 and 42 U.S.C. § 1983, and have willfully conspired against the Petitioner and her minor children's First, Fifth, Ninth, and Fourteenth Amendment rights guaranteed to us by the United States Constitution (collective guaranteed rights), because the Maryland Mortgage task force was created to launder money with Judicial

force, because the FBI is tasked with the Authority to investigate Economic Espionage, but turned a blind eye to it, because they are not Treasury staff.

However, I am a displaced Treasury official from the Internal Revenue Service, with a fiduciary obligation to protect my Nation from Domestic and Foreign enemies, and in every action I have filed in the United States District Court for the District of Maryland and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, simply because Judicial officers utilized the prestige of their positions to advance the interest of the illegal work group the Maryland Mortgage task Force, that was not authorized to use Federal Law to advance the interest of organized criminals in the State of Maryland in both private and public sector.

ARGUENDO

Pumphrey v. K. W. Thompson Tool Co., 62 F.3d 1128, 1130 (9th Cir.1995). (FRCP “60(b) provides that a judgment may be set aside for fraud upon the court. One species of fraud upon the court occurs when an ‘officer of the court’ perpetrates fraud affecting the ability of the court or jury to impartially judge a case. *Id.* at 1132-33: ‘[T]he inquiry as to whether a judgment should be set aside for fraud upon the court under Rule 60(b) focuses [on] whether the alleged fraud harms the integrity of the judicial process.’”) *Shammas v. Shammas*, supra note 32, 88 A.2d at 208, “[U]pon principle, we hold that relief for fraud upon the court may be

Amendments to the United States Constitution (collective guaranteed rights), and Supreme Court precedent *Owen v. City of Independence*, 445 U.S. 622 (1980).

The fraud extends beyond Mortgage Fraud, and is occurring in all judicial orders that are being issued by Judges who are participating in the scheme with the sole intent of weakening the U.S. Economy for the Deutsch Bank, et al., who owns my former Employer Strayer University, who relied on the Maryland Mortgage task force to advance their interest using select judicial officers in the State and Federal courts; and where Judges Diaz, Dunan, and Thacker in close proximity to depriving the Petitioner of constitutional rights, also engaged in 18 U.S.C. § 242 Civil Rights deprivation by failing to reinstate the Petitioner to a position upon recovering from a temporary disability Pregnancy, after being granted an FMLA extension Human Resources.

The United States Supreme Court held in the matter of *Young v. UPS*, that in the matter of pregnancy discrimination that the employer failed to accommodate, and thus sided with Mrs. Young upon holding that if the employer accommodates some disabilities that it has to accommodate pregnancy.

The Case that I would raise to the United States Supreme Court is that if employers must accommodate some disabilities that they must reinstate their employees to their original positions after the disability in connection with the pregnancy is cured and the employee is medically released to return to duty. The