

No. \_\_\_\_\_

---

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

ROBERT ALLEN RICHARDS JR.,

Petitioner,

v.

County of Los Angeles, et al

Respondents.

---

On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the

United States Court of Appeals

For the Ninth Circuit

---

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

---

ROBERT A. RICHARDS JR.

P.O. Box 4442

Lancaster, CA 93539

661-965-3555

---

## QUESTION PRESENTED

1. The District Court did not let me Re-establish my standing in the new lower court when they changed courts.

### STANDING

Your honors I am a living being.

The flesh lives and the blood  
flows. Your honors I humbly  
ask for cure and maintenance.

Canon Law Divine Person Canon  
835-838.

2. The Appeals court and the District court erred by granting a motion to dismiss against petitioner and showed how incompetent they are by using The Rooker-Feldman doctrine in a Civil RICO Paternity Fraud lawsuit. Child Support is federal Law under the Social Security Act SEC. 460. [42 U.S.C. 660] The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction, without regard to any amount in controversy to hear and determine any civil action

*Cont'd*

certified by the Secretary of Health and Human Services under section 452(a)(8) of this Act. A civil action under this section may be brought in any judicial district in which the claim arose, the plaintiff

resides, or the defendant resides.

*See Iqbal v. Patel*, F.3d, 2015 WL 859541 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir, 2015) and *Exxon Mobil v. Saudi Basic Industries Corp.* No. 3-1696. Argued February 23, 2005-Decided March 30, 2005  
Citation omitted. Canon Law Positive Law Canon 666-672, Canon Law Fraud 998-1007.

3. The Appeals and the District Court erred by allowing a Bill of Attainder to be used against the Petitioner. *See* App. A3 and App. A4. The Enterprise (Family Court) is administrative process from executive and cannot give judicial by Bill of Attainder. Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution. Canon Law 998-1007, Canon Law Concealment 1661-1672.

**TABLE OF CONTENT**

QUESTION PRESENTED.....	i
TABLE OF AUTHORIES.....	iii
TABLE OF APPENDICES.....	vi
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	1
STANDING.....	1
REASON FOR GRANTING	
THE GRANTING THE	
PETITONER.....	17,18
CONCLUSION.....	19

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

Case Laws	Page(s)
-----------	---------

<i>Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Saudi Basic Industries Corp.,</i> 544 U.S. 280 (2005).....	ii
---	----

<i>Hodge v. Craig</i> , No. M2009-00930-COA-R3-CV, 2010 WL 4024990, at *12 (Tenn. Ct. App. Oct. 13, 2010)...	13
--	----

<i>Iqbal v. Patel</i> , F3d, 2015 WL859541 (7 <sup>th</sup> Cir.2015).....	ii
--	----

*Salinas v. U.S.*, 118 S. Ct. 469....4

*Schware v. Board of Examiners*,  
353 U.S. 238,239.....6

*Sims v. Aherns*, 271 S.W. 720  
(1925).....6

**Statutes**

8 U.S.C. 1324, 1342c.....3,16  
18 U.S.C. 1028.....15  
18 U.S.C. 1341, 1343, 1347.....5  
18 U.S.C. 1962(d).....3,4  
28 U.S.C. 1254(1).....vii  
Secretary of Health Human  
Service Social Service Act  
Sec. 208[42 U.S.C. 408].....15  
Sec. 460[42 U.S.C. 660].....i,17  
Sec. 466[42 U.S.C. 666].....14  
452(a)(8).....ii

**Constitutional**

Article 1 and Article 2  
of the Constitution.....8,10  
Bill of Attainder.....ii,10  
6<sup>th</sup> Amendment.....10

**Public Law**

Public Law 102-14(1991).....3,8

**Canon Laws**

Canon Law Positive Canon Law	
Canon 666-672.....	ii
Canon Law Document	
Canon 779-789.....	14,15
Canon Law Divine Person	
Canon 835-838.....	i,2
Canon Law Corruption	
Canon 994-997.....	7
Canon Law Fraud	
Canon 998-1007.....	ii,5,8
Canon Law Taxes	
Canon 1357-1373.....	5
Canon Law Concealment	
Canon 1661-1672.....	ii,5
Canon Law Public	
Canon 1724-1729.....	4,8
Canon Law Private Law	
Canon 1730-1734.....	8,12
Canon Law Competency	
Canon 1813-1818.....	5,8

**Penal Codes**

Cal. P.C. Sec. 266h,	
Cal. P.C. Sec. 266i.....	2
Paternity Fraud.....	2

## **Index of Appendices**

Opinion, *In re: RICO Fraud Case Litigation*,  
No. 17-56732 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir.) May 15, 2018).App.A1  
*Opinion, In re: RICO Fraud Case*,  
CV17-0400PSG(AGRx) Oct. 20, 2017..App.B1

## **Other Sources**

Rooker-Feldman doctrine.....i  
Black's Laws (4<sup>th</sup> Edition).....6  
Corpus Juris Seundum, Volume 7,  
Section 4.....7  
BAR [British Accreditation  
Registry].....6,8

## **PARTY TO THE PROCEEDING**

ROBERT ALLEN RICHARDS JR.  
Was the plaintiff in the District  
Court and the appellant in the  
Ninth Circuit.  
County of Los Angeles (CSSD)  
Maria Del Guardado "AKA"  
Maria Perez  
Jesus D, Perez ESQ.  
Derek Williams  
Were the defendants in the  
District Court and the appellees  
in the Ninth Circuit.

### **OPINIONS BELOW**

The Ninth Circuit's opinion not for publication and reproduced at App. A1. The district court's opinion submitted on October 20, 2017 and reproduced at App. B1.

### **JURISDICTION**

The Ninth Circuit issued its opinion May 20, 2018 and filed May 23, 2018. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. 1254(1).

### **CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED**

The Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution (Article VI, Clause 2) establishes that the Constitution, federal laws made pursuant to it, and treaties made under its authority, constitute the supreme law of the land.

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

### **Standing**

Your honors, I am a man,  
An Israelite, I am an heir to Talmud  
as it written. The Talmud 'claims'  
a covenant was made with Moloch!!  
I do not call myself a Jew by 16<sup>th</sup>  
century fictional word as it the  
opposed to Yahud or Israelite

Your honors, I am a living  
being, the blood flows, the  
flesh Lives. We sovereign  
and nothing stands between  
myself and the divine. A  
Rabbi argue with God and  
Won. This court will be in  
dishonor if I do not receive  
the maximum cure and  
maintenance as a descendant  
of Akhenaten. Canon Divine  
Person Canon 835-838.

**A. Background**

On February 26, 2002 the birth of child the Petitioner an Israelite was scammed into paying child support for the child that is not his and was duped by Respondent a goy (Guardado) an undocumented worker from Mexico to receive tax, free money from a hard working military veteran. For her Pimp goy boyfriend (Williams). Respondents (Guardado),(Williams) violated Cal. P.C. Sec. 266h, Cal. P.C. 266i and Paternity Fraud.

Respondents goims (Guardado), (Williams) have a Hooker and Pimp relationship, are the biological parents of the child.

The Petitioner many requests for a paternity testing that was denied by all goims Respondents (CSSD), (Guardado),(Perez) and (Williams).

Respondent a goy (Guardado) hired her ex-father in-law a goy (Perez) to represent her in Paternity case so she could fight the Paternity Testing and receive Child Support from the Petitioner. Respondents goims (CSSD), (Perez) are in violation of 8 U.S.C.

1324 Bring in and harboring certain aliens co-Respondent (Guardado) a goy undocumented Alien from Mexico of 3.2.

Immigration consequences of a pimping or pandering conviction.

Crime of moral turpitude in California could make you Immediately deportable.

Respondents goims (CSSD), (Perez), (Guardado) and (Williams) violated Public Law 102-14 Mar.20, 1991 102d Congress against the Petitioner. Canon Law Public Law 1724-1729. Each Respondents (CSSD), (Perez), (Guardado) and (Williams) committed 18 U.S.C. 1962(d).

### **The Supreme Court's Salinas ruling undermines *Antar***

After *Antar* was decided, the Supreme Court issued its opinion in *Salinas v. U.S.*, 118 S. Ct. 469 (1997). That case addressed liability under the RICO conspiracy statute, section 1962(d). The result in *Salinas* undermined *Antar*'s concern with preserving *Reves* from a flank attack under the conspiracy statute.

### **Conclusion**

*Berg*'s resolution, or the Third Circuit's determination of the issue in another case, will likely permit a defendant who could not be liable under section 1962(c) – because he or she did not manage or operate the enterprise – to remain subject to liability through the back door of section 1962(d). *Salinas* strongly appears to permit this broader application since a person may be liable for conspiracy, even though he or she was "incapable" of committing the substantive offense; and the Supreme Court's *Beck dicta* confirms that interpretation.

Respondent (CSSD) a goy admits to RICO Fraud predicate crimes in the answering brief on March 7, 2017 and to this day that mail fraud and wire fraud occurred with the interception of the Petitioner's State and Federal Income taxes. Canon Law Taxes Canon 1357-1373.

18 U.S.C. 1341, 1343, 1344 and 1347

Respondent (Perez) is a member Of the BAR in California and Texas showed his incompetency by denying paternity testing several times. To get taxes free money and health benefits from the Petitioner. For Co-Respondent (Guardado) using fraudulent paperwork. Canon Law Concealment 1661-1672, Canon Law Fraud 998-1007, Canon Law Competency 1813-1818.

BAR = British Accreditation Regency  
Black's Law (4th Edition): REGENCY.

Rule; government; kingship. The man or body of men intrusted (sic) with the vicarious government of a kingdom during the minority, absence, insanity, or other disability of the king.

REGENT. A governor or ruler. One who vicariously administers the government of a kingdom, in the name of the king, during the latter's minority or other disability.

AS PER THE UNITED STATES  
SUPREME COURT;

The practice of Law CAN NOT be  
licensed by any state/State.  
(Schware v. Board of Examiners,  
353 U.S. 238, 239)

The practice of Law is AN  
OCCUPATION OF COMMON RIGHT!  
(Sims v. Aherns, 271 S.W. 720 (1925)

The "CERTIFICATE" from the State Supreme Court:

- Only authorizes, to practice law in courts as a member of the state judicial branch of government.

[Correction: membership is to a private corporation listed on Dun and Bradstreet, for example - JUDICIARY/SUPREME COURTS OF THE STATE OF OHIO.]

- Can only represent wards of the court, infants, and persons of unsound mind.

(See CORPUS JURIS SECUNDUM, VOLUME 7, SECTION 4.)

A "CERTIFICATE" is not a license to practice law as an occupation, nor to do business as a law firm!!

Canon Law Corruption 994-997.

The state BAR card is not a license!!! It is a union dues card. . The BAR is a professional association. • Like the actors union, painters union, etc.

- No other association, even doctors, issue their own license. All are issued by the STATE OF.

Respondent (Perez) a goy violating  
Canon Law Private Law 1730-1734  
and Public Law 102-14.

The BAR is a non-governmental private  
association.

The State BAR is;

- An unconstitutional monopoly
- An illegal and criminal enterprise
- Violates Article 2, Section 1, Separation  
of Powers clause of the U.S Constitution.  
Canon Law Fraud 998-1007. Canon Law  
Competency 1813-1818.

There is no power or authority for  
joining of Legislative, Judicial,  
or Executive branches within a  
state as the BAR is attempting.

BAR members have invaded  
all branches of government and are  
attempting to control de jure  
governments as agents of a foreign  
entity!

It is quite simple to see that a great fraud and conspiracy has been perpetrated on the people of America. The American BAR [British Accreditation Registry] is an offshoot from London Lawyers' Guild and was established by people with invasive monopolistic goals in mind. The public in California was shocked to learn that the state government has no control or jurisdiction over the BAR Association or its members. The state does not accredit the law schools or hold BAR examinations. They do not issue state licenses to lawyers. The BAR Association accredits all the law schools, holds their private examinations and selects the students they will accept in their organization and issues them so-called licenses but keeps the fees for themselves. The BAR is the only one that can punish or disbar a lawyer.

Citizens are not permitted to act like people in the courts. The Citizen (2nd class) is told that he does not know how to fill out fancy lawyer forms; that he is not trained in the law; that he does not know court rules and procedures; etc. This is an unconstitutional "lawyer system"; only hearsay substitutes (lawyers), not under oath, have access to the fiction/for profit and gain courts, even though only sworn testimony and evidence can be presented in court. Anything else is "Bill of Attainder," not permitted under the U.S. Constitution (Article 1, Sections 9 and 10).

The U.S. Constitution does not give anyone the right to a lawyer or the right to counsel, or the right to any other hearsay substitute. The 6th Amendment is very specific, that the accused only has the right to the assistance of counsel and this assistance of counsel can be anyone the accused chooses without limitation.

The U.S. Constitution, being the supreme fundamental law, is not and cannot be ambiguous as to be interpreted, or it would be a worthless piece of paper and we would have millions of interpretations (unconstitutional amendments) instead of the few we have now. That is why all judges and public servants are sworn to support the U.S. Constitution, not interpret it.

Case law is unconstitutional: as case law is enacted by the judicial branch of government. When a lawyer-judge instructs, directs, or gives orders to a jury, the lawyer-judge is tampering with the jury. He also tampers with testimony when he orders the answers to be either "Yes" or "No." The lawyer-judge also tampers, fixes, and rigs the trial when he orders anything stricken from the record, or when he "rules" certain evidence and the truth to be inadmissible.

Lawyers, as officers of the court, in the Judicial Branch, are unconstitutionally in two branches of government at the same time whenever they are hired or elected to the executive or legislative branches. This is a violation of the separation of powers, checks and balances, and the conflict of interest laws. District attorneys and STATE attorneys have taken over the Grand Juries from the people, where the people are denied access to the Grand Juries when they attempt to present evidence of crimes committed in the courtrooms by the lawyers and lawyer-judges.

Canon Law Private Law 1730-1734.

**B. The new District Court**

**Erred by letting Respondent (Guardado) Off whom was in Discovery with the First District Court? Without Filing a motion to a dismiss And have answer the Complaint See App B4<sup>1</sup>**  
The First District Court agreed with the Petitioner that was enough evidence to move into a motion of Discovery against Respondent a goy (Guardado). Subpoenas was Issued in this Civil RICO Paternity Fraud case.

Respondent (Guardado) is very incompetent in this Paternity Fraud Lawsuit, *See Hodge v. Craig* No. M2009-009300-SC-R11-CV, 2010 WL 4024990, at \*12 (Tenn. Ct App. Oct 13, 2010). Petitioner was never given a DNA test that is required for paternity establishment.

*Cont'd*

Respondents (CSSD) and (Perez) changed the court to a more favorable court. I was never notified of the change until the order filed the same day of change of The court. The First court was doing excellent job.

**C. The District Court**  
**Erroneously disregarded an important Document,**  
The District Court said, they did not have the document in front of them.  
Showing defendants violated SSA Sec. 466 [42 U.S.C.666](5)(A)(i)(B)(i).  
Canon Law Document  
Canon 779-789.

*Cont'd*

On the reverse side of the document was clearly stated in the highlighted area "that by blood and genetic testing that prove the man is not the Biological father. It also may be overturned if the father or mother is able to prove that he/she signed the form because of Fraud, Duress, mistake of fact."

*See App. B 4 footnote<sup>2</sup>*

The District court erroneously allowed the Respondents (CSSD), (Perez), (Williams) and (Guardado) to commit SSA Sec. 208[42 U.S.C. 408] and Identity Theft [18 U.S.C. 1028] against the Petitioner.

**D. Respondents (Perez), (CSSD) helped (Guardado) fill out fraudulent paperwork by saying the child did not have health care, when the child does violating 8 U.S.C. 1342c. The District Court allowed this fraud to continue to receive more money and health insurance from the Petitioner.**

**E. The Ninth circuit showed their incompetency by not being able to overturn the lower Court's decision.**  
See App. A3, A4 and App. B32, B36 in which The District Court has Subject Matter Jurisdiction under SSA Sec. 460[42 U.S.C 660].

## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

This Petition will be granted because The District Court and Appeal Court can not overturn the wrong decision made against the Petitioner. Child Support Enforcement is under federal Law and guidelines SSA Sec. 460 [42 U.S.C. 660]. The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction, without regard to any amount in controversy, to hear and determine any civil action certified by the Secretary of Health and Human Services under section 452(a)(8) of this Act. A civil action under this section may be brought in any judicial district in which the claim arose, the plaintiff resides, or the defendant resides.

Secondly, Paternity testing should be Mandatory before you sign a birth certificate or declaration of parentage.

And have a clause where if the mother does not inform the alleged father he may not be the Biological father then he is exonerated from all liability as he signed the document under fraud, duress and now is a victim of Paternity Fraud. By charging the with crimes and penalties with fines. This will overnight stop good men from being duped into fathering children that are not theirs.

**Conclusion**

Petitioner prays that this Court  
will Reverses the lower District  
Court decision based on the  
Fraud and Theft done by the  
Respondents a goy against an  
Israelite under Public Law  
102-14 (1991). This will be in  
dishonor if I do not receive the  
maximum cure and maintenance.  
Canon Law Concealment Canon  
1661-1672, Canon Law Taxes  
Canon 1357-1373, Canon Law  
Fraud Canon 998-1007 and Canon  
Law positive Law Canon 666-672.

The petition for a writ of  
Certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully Submitted,

Robert A. Richards Jr.

P.O. Box 4442

Lancaster CA 93539

661-965-3555

Petitioner      August 18, 2018