

No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Jaiynah Bey — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.
Elmwood Place Police et Al RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

United States Court of Appeals for Sixth Circuit
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Jaiynah Bey
(Your Name)

C/O P.O. Box 32052
(Address)

Cincinnati Ohio 45232
(City, State, Zip Code)

NA
(Phone Number)

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

The United States Constitution forth bill of right protects the people in their private capacity from any unlawful stops, search and seziors without a warrant and probable cause.

The questions presented are:

1. Can a police randomly stop and force you off the road to randomly inspect your private property without probable cause to impose a program on people that is strictly for those engaged in commerce
2. Can a 3rd party come and take your flesh and blood baby based off an unconstitutional traffic stop even if you and your baby are not a member/employee of that corporation.

LIST OF PARTIES

All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.

All parties **do not** appear in the caption of the case on the cover page. A list of all parties to the proceeding in the court whose judgment is the subject of this petition is as follows:

Eric Crosssty - Police for Elmwood Place Police

Rodney Anderson - Owner of Hot Rod Tow Truck

Victoria Baldrick employees of Hamiton County
Jobs & Family Services

Katie Woodside Employee of Hamiton County
Moira Weir, Agency Director of Jobs & Family
Services

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....	1
JURISDICTION.....	1
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	2
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT.....	3
CONCLUSION.....	19

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A Appeal for Sixth Circuit order to dismiss case and affirm district court judgment

APPENDIX B
Affidavit Crossby wrote he did a random check

APPENDIX C
order of Sixth Circuit Court Denied motion to stay

APPENDIX D

Order/opinion of the United States district court

APPENDIX E

The Report & Recommendation of magistrate

APPENDIX F

No.

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

Jaiyanah Bey,
Petitioner(s)

v.

Elmwood Place Police Department,
Respondent(s)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner, Jaiyanah Bey respectful prays that a writ of certiorari issued to review the judgment order of the United States Court of appeals for the sixth circuit entered on May 18, 2018.

OPINIONS BELOW

This petition seeks review of unreported order dismissing the case see appendix A. The denial of motion to stay reprinted as appendix C

STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION

The decision of the united states of appeals for the sixth circuit was filed on May 18 2018. The denial of motion to stay was filed August 1st 2018. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1) and the United States Constitution 1789 Article III Section 1

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS INVOLVED

United States Constitution 1789, Bill of Rights IV:

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and

particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

United States Constitution 1789, Bill of Rights V:

No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself; nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.

STATEMENTS OF THE CASE

FACTS:

This case arises from the Petitioner Jaiyanah Bey traveling on August 2nd 2016, on my way home with my young son, when I noticed I was being stalked and followed then forced off the road by employee Eric Crossty working for Elmwood Place police department.

Eric Crossty while standing on the road next to me implying that he knew me and became upset when I did not engage, Instead I asked him, what was the reason for him hindering and detaining me from my travels? Since I saw flashing red and blue lights which indicates a National emergency, I asked him was some crime committed to which he said no.

I asked again, why did you force me off the road, hinder, and detain me?

His response was "the tags on my property were expired".

He asked for a driver's licenses. I gave him my Identification Card. He told me he was calling his supervisor. He told me that he can only identify me by the last

known name registered to the personal property 4 years ago. After waiting for a while a tow truck pulled up and Eric Crossty came to me and told me he along with Rodney Anderson an employee/owner of HOT ROD TOWING were stealing my property.

I asked under what authority he, Eric Crossty, has to steal my property without due process of law. He began yelling at me telling me to get out the car.

My young son was in the back seat became fearful and began crying.

Since Eric Crossty had a gun in plain sight, under fear for the life of myself and my son, I told Eric Crossty and his hired tow truck driver that they can steal my property but I will not get out on this dark street as I did not feel safe at that location with two unknown males, one with a gun, that I did not know.

I was terrified for myself and my child of Eric Crossty. Since I take shelter on the next street over and felt safe getting out at home.

Eric Crossty began yelling again and this time charging at my window with his hand on his side. I was so scared I urinated on myself, put the car in gear and went home to safety.

“The law’s concept of the family rests on a presumption that parents possess what a child lacks in maturity, experience, and capacity for judgment required for making life’s difficult decisions. More important, historically it has recognized that natural bonds of affection lead parents to act in the best interests of their children. The stated notion that governmental power should supersede parental authority in all cases because some parents abuse and neglect children is repugnant to American

tradition. Simply because the decision of a parent is not agreeable to a child or because it involves risks does not automatically transfer the power to make that decision from the parents to some agency or officer of the state.— *Parham v. J. R.*, 442 U.S. 584 (1979)

I pulled into my drive way, got out the car and put my hands up, I did not want Eric Crossty to have a reason to shoot and murder me. Eric Crossty pushed me into the side of his car, and began slamming me into my automobile twice. Eric Crossty and his tow truck driver put restraints on my hands and took me to an undisclosed location and stole my property. “A Law which authorizes the taking of private property without compensation, ... can not be considered as due process of law in a free government.: Chicago etc, R.R. Co. v. Chicago, 166 U.S. 226, [41 L. Ed.979,17 sup. Ct. Rep.581].” *Associated etc. Co. v Railroad Commission* 176 Cal. 518, 528-530 Eric Crossty verbally abused and intentionally harmed and endangered me and my son. My family was extorted of a certain sum of income in order to pay the demanded income to get me liberated two days later.

On August 4th, 2016, employees of HAMILTON County Corporation(Hamilton County Jobs and Family Services) Victoria Baldrick under threat attempted to get me to engage in some sort of contractual obligation with them. I informed the employees that I do not wish to contract nor provide them with any of my private and confidential information.

I asked them to provide documented proof of jurisdiction over me and my baby and what authority do they have to kidnap my child.

I have never heard of nor engaged in any actions of a contractual nature with HAMILTON corporation and if such a contract exists please produce the document so that I may examine it to determine the lawfulness of any alleged obligation where I waived with complete knowledge my Right to Privacy and my right to be left alone, which is protected under the 4th Bill of Rights of the American Constitution 1791, wherein my rights are secured and protected from encroachment.

“Waivers of Constitutional Rights, not only must they be voluntary, they must be knowingly intelligent acts done with sufficient awareness.” Brady v. U.S., 397 U.S. 742, 748.

“Right of privacy is a personal right designed to protect a person from unwanted disclosure of personal information.” CNA Financial Corporation v Local 743, 515 F. Supp.942.

Employees of HAMILTON corporation allege to have filed an emergency custody hearing for the control of my baby through internal policies of a ministerial hearing officer, not a lawfully sanctioned court.

The ministerial hearing officier Katie Woodside was held at Hamilton County Juvenile Court, that same day on August 4th 2016, without any proper services or notice to me.

“Due Process requires the right to receive adequate notice “A judgment may not be rendered in violation of constitutional protections. The validity of a judgment may be affected by a failure to give the constitutionally required due process notice and an opportunity to be heard. Earle v. McVeigh, 91 US 503, 23 L Ed 398.”

A deprivation of a fair and impartial hearing, which is constitutionally secured right guaranteed by the 4th Bill Of Right of the American Constitution 1791. Questions arise as to jurisdiction and Delegation of Authority over me and my baby, which must be produced for the record in order for (any) to make demands on me and my son.

As HAMILTON County and its sub division is a corporation, there can be no granted judicial authority by the Legislature, that Legislature being the Congress of the United States as affirmed in Article 1 of the American Constitution 1791 having authority to write law and grant powers to any inferior court, Article III of said American Constitution 1791.

"Ministerial officers are incompetent to receive grants of judicial power from the legislature; their acts in attempting to exercise such powers are necessarily nullities." Burns v. Sup., Ct., SF, 140 Cal. 1.

Failure to produce any delegated authority is proof that HAMILTON corporation and its sub-corporations did in fact bring injury to me and my baby. We have been deprive of our liberties as the employees of HAMILTON corporation engage in and commit human trafficking and genocide upon my family.

"Every child shall be entitled from his birth to a name and a nationality". (Rights of the Child 1959)

Inferior Court: *This term may denote any court subordinate to the chief appellate tribunal in the particular judicial system (e.g. trial court); but it is also commonly used as the designation of a court of special, limited, or statutory jurisdiction, whose record must show the existence And attaching of jurisdiction in any given case, in order to give presumptive validity to its judgment.*

There is no discretion to ignore lack of jurisdiction. Joyce v U.S. 474 2d 215 ;); "Jurisdiction can be challenged at any time " and "jurisdiction, once challenged, cannot be assumed and must be decided". Basso v Utah Power and Light Co. 495 F.2d 906,910.

HAMILTON corporation must provide substantial and lawful, binding proof that I consented and granted any of its employees' Rights over my Child, which supersede mine as his Mother. Being aboriginal and indigenous, I have the 'Individual and Collective Right' to Live in Freedom, Peace and Security as a Distinct People, and a 'Right' to the full guarantees against Genocide or any other 'Acts of Violence',

including the Removal of Indigenous Children From Their Families and Communities Under Any Pretext See Universal Declaration of the Rights Of Indigenous People Part I; Article 6. In addition I have the Individual Right to Life, Physical and Mental Integrity, Liberty and Security of Person. See Universal Declaration of the Rights Of Indigenous People Part II; Article 6.

The employees of HAMILTON corporation and its sub-corporation CANNOT determine what is best for me or my baby.

“Under The United States Republic’s Constitutional system of Government and upon the individuality and intelligence of the citizen, the state does not claim to control one’s conduct to others, leaving one the sole judge as to all that affects oneself.” Mugler v. Kansas 123 US 623, 659 – 60:

“The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people. Indicating those certain rights do not fall directly under the U.S. Constitution, therefore the need for the 10th amendment: The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the people.

“The rights of parents to the care, custody and nurture of their children is of such character that it cannot be denied without violating those fundamental principles of liberty and justice which lie at the base of all our civil and political institutions, and such right is a fundamental right protected by this amendment (First), Amendments 5, and 9.” Doe v. Irwin, 441 F Supp 1247; U.S. D.C. of Michigan, (1985)

“The Due Process Clause does not permit a State to infringe on the fundamental right of parents to make child rearing decisions simply because a state judge believes a ‘better’ decision could be made.” Troxel v. Granville, 530 U.S. 57 (2000)

I had nowhere to go to receive help from the deprivation of rights from HAMILTON corporation and its sub division Hamiton County Jobs and family Services. So I sought relief in the federal court see case number: 1:16cv00823 in the United States District Court Southern District of Ohio. Immediately filing a lawsuit in the federal court in an attempt to create an immediate estoppel on everything that the un sanctioned ministerial hearing employees were doing. They did not adhere to the estoppel and I was force to make a special appearance at the Hamilton county

Ministerial Hearing where the alleged hearing officer ignored my Mandatory Judicial Notice of a right to a jury trial of my peers, right to excise my religious and self-determination and to association. I was praying that the court take emergency Injunction and declaratory judgment action, however the Lawsuit set on the docket for over a year in the United States District Court Southern District Of Ohio Western Division while employees working for Hamilton County held my baby hostess. District Court dismissed the case for failure to state a claim from which a relief can be granted as if the return of a Flesh and Blood baby is not a relief that can be granted and denied my default judgment on Rodney Anderson even though he never appeared. I appealed and court agreed with the district court.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

This case presents two critical issues for the future of public servants, employees working for private corporations on American soil and the unalienable, inalienable rights of the natural people. (1) Whether the employees of a private Corporations on American soil in this case “Elmwood Place police department corporation” and “Hamilton County corporation” have the authority to impose a program on people that is strictly for generating income at the expense of the peoples unalienable / inalienable liberties where their alleged services are not solicited

“Every man is independent of all laws, except those prescribed by nature. He is not bound by any institutions formed by his fellowman without his consent.” Cruden v.

Neale, 2 N.C. 338 (1796) 2 S.E. The common law is the real law, the Supreme Law of the land, the code, rules, regulations, policy and statutes are "not the law", [Self v. Rhay, 61 Wn (2d) 261].

In order for the police to stop and hinder the Petitioner the police must show probable cause. The police admits that he did not witness Petitioner commit any crime, or causing any threat to the public prior to him forcing Petitioner off the road. He also admits that Petitioner was traveling on the land when he forced, harass and detained Petitioner. (See police statement Appendix B) The Court long ago recognized that the people have an inalienable right to travel and our constitutional concepts of personal liberty unite to require that all citizens be free to travel throughout the length and breadth of our land uninhibited by statutes, rules, or regulations which unreasonably burden or restrict this movement see Passenger Cases, 7 How. 283, 48 U. S. 492. "It is a right that has been firmly established and repeatedly recognized see U.S. v Guest, 383 U.S. 745 (1966). In fact, in Shapiro v Thompson, 394 U.S. 618 (1969), Justice Stewart noted in a concurring opinion that "it is a right broadly assertable against private interference as well as governmental action. Like the right of association ... it is a virtually unconditional personal right, guaranteed by the Constitution to us all." Since the Police did not witness Petitioner commit a crime or breach of peace, and a random inspection is not a probable cause. Therefore he had no right to hinder Petitioner from her travels, and to deprive Petitioner of her right to travel (forcing me off the road using flashing lights). Traveling in an automobile on the public roads was not a threat to the

public safety or health and constituted no hazard to the public, and such a traveler owed nothing more than “due care” (as regards to tort for negligence) to the public and the owner owed no other duty to the public (eg. State), he / she and his / her auto, having equal rights to and on the roadways / highways as horses and wagons, etc.; this same right is still substantive rule, in that speeding, running stop signs, traveling without license plates, or registration are not threats to the public safety, and thus, are not arrestable offenses. Christy v. Elliot, 216 I 131, 74 HE 1035, LRA NS 1905 – 1. It is also well known that the inspection the police forced on my private property only applies to persons engaging in commerce see Title 49 “Motor Vehicle Registration and Driver License program” Section 30301. The Oregon Supreme Court, as well, ruled (see generally Kalich v. Knapp, 73 Or. 558) “the legislature has no power to regulate the people or their automobiles.” The traffic stop was not based on probable cause, or reasonable suspicion, and was not a valid administrative stop because my personal property was not a commercial vehicle subject to random safety inspections. Hence, the warrantless stop was unconstitutional. Moreover, the Police (Eric Crossty) mistaken belief concerning the statutory regulatory scheme did not save the stop, search, and seizure because the trooper had no lawful authority to make the random inspection and there was no reasonable suspicion or probable cause. Thus, the good-faith exception did not apply See United States v. Herrea, F. 3d 05- 3057 (10th Cir. (Kan.) Apr. 19, 2006). The Police did not show probable cause therefore any and everything the police alleged to charge the Petitioner after the stop, was and is null and void because he had no

authority to hinder Petitioner in the first place. "All laws, rules and practices which are repugnant to the Constitution are null and void" [Marbury v. Madison, 5th US (2 Cranch) 137, 180

Therefore A State may not impose a charge for the enjoyment of a right granted by the Federal Constitution." Murdock v. Pennsylvania, 319 U.S. 105, at 113.

The private contractor, "Elmwood Place Police Department" do not have authority and power over the peoples unalienable / inalienable right to locomotion which exceeds there jurisdiction. The American Constitution 1791, 9th and 10th Bill of Rights assure and guarantee that all powers must be delegated and if any power have not been granted by the people individually for those who chose to associate with a group pursuant to the American Constitution 1791 they are reserved to the state and the people respectively.

The People living on the American Soil have the right to self-determination and rights to association/disassociate as guaranteed in the United States Constitution 1st Bill of Right. (2). How can employees of a private corporation "Hamilton County Jobs and Family Services" have the authority to force a natural flesh and blood Being to associate with their corporate alleged services, indirectly take away religious freedom and deprive the people of their right to self-determination in order to generate income at the expense of the natural people. (taking the people children in order to receive federal funds). There is no where in the American Constitution does it give private companies/corporation jurisdiction over flesh and blood beings who are not a member of said corporation. Subject matter can mean over the

“person” meaning I or my flesh and blood baby is one of their subjects, member, or employee, of the Hamilton County Corporation. Employees of Hamilton County has not provided variable documentation that me or my son is one of their subjects, members or employees of said corporation and to force me to be a member would violate the 1st Bill of Rights of the American Constitution where it protect the people’s right to associate and right to disassociate. See United States Attorney General “Federal Law protections for religious liberty” October 6 2017 Appendix page 3a where it states “even a neutral, generally applicable law is subject to strict scrutiny under this Clause if it restricts the free exercise of religion and another constitutionally protected liberty, such as the freedom of speech or association, or the right to control the upbringing of one's children. See Smith, 494 U.S. at 881-82; Axson-Flynn v. Johnson, 356 F.3d 1277, 1295-97 (10th Cir. 2004).

This would also be in violation of constitutional secured religion rights, as the Constitution protects the people religious freedom. The President executive order 13798 4, 82 Fed. Reg. 21675 along with attorney General “Federal Law protections for Religious Liberty” states Religious liberty is in the text or our constitution... It encompasses the right of all Americans to exercise their religion freely... In the United States, the free exercise of religion is not a mere policy preference to be traded against other policy preferences. It is a fundamental Right see principles of religious liberty number 1. Also see Article 33 (1) United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. “Indigenous people have the right to determine their own identity or membership in accordance with their customs and traditions.”

If speaking of subject being the topic of the issue, the issue or subject is human trafficking, genocide, and religious freedom which all fall under the constitution A flesh and blood baby has been unlawfully kept away from his flesh and blood mother by a corporation (Hamilton County Jobs and family services) who lacks jurisdiction to do so on all levels and is receiving payments for holding him and the said corporation Hamilton county juvenile court agreed to such act which they had no authority to do so. There can be no reason for removing my flesh and blood baby from his family. See Universal Declaration of the Rights Of Indigenous People Part I; Article 6. "The Child shall not be the subject of traffic, in any form, special care and protection shall be provided both to him and to his mother" see Declaration of the Rights of the Child. Principle 4

We have recognized on numerous occasions that the relationship between parent and child is constitutionally protected *Smith v. Organization of Foster Families*, 431 U.S. 816 (1977)

The Alleged judges Katie Woodside at the Hamilton County juvenile court made a void judgment order to kidnap my baby alleging an "emergency custody based on allegations where the Petitioner was not found guilty of/ petitioner day to be heard for those allegations was on the 29th of august 2016. On August 4th 2016 Jaiyanah Bey demanded the employees of the municipal corporation(Hamilton County Juvenile Court) to show documented proof of jurisdiction and to show a receipt that she was served with a compliant and given a lawful due process right to be heard and face her accuser as afforded in the American Constitution 1791. No

Documented proof of jurisdiction was provided and due process of law was completely ignored. On August 8th 2016 Jaiyanah Bey filed a civil complaint in the federal court for the acts that took place on August 2nd, 2016 and August 4th, 2016. On August 18th most of the employees of the foreign municipal corporation were served. On August 18th 2016 said employees used standing militia to break into where I was dwelling, physically assault me and kidnap my baby. On August 18th 2016 I was kidnapped and held hostage(put in jail) and extortion of income. On September 2nd 2016 I filed an "emergency complaint" regarding the retaliation and kidnapping of my baby.

1. Denial of due process of law

Every person is entitled to an opportunity to be heard in a court of law upon every question involving his rights or interests, before he is affected by any judicial decision on the question. Earle v McVeigh, 91 US 503, 23 L Ed 398.

2. No Proof of Jurisdiction

An order that exceeds the jurisdiction of the court, is void, or voidable, and can be attacked in any proceeding in any court where the validity of the judgment comes into issue. (See Rose v. Himely (1808) 4 Cranch 241, 2 L Ed 608; Pennoyer v. Neff (1877) 95 US 714, 24 L Ed 565; Thompson v. Whitman (1873) 18 Wall 457, 21 L ED 897; Windsor v. McVeigh (1876) 93 US 274, 23 L Ed 914; McDonald v. Mabee (1917) 243 US 90t, 37 Sct 343, 61 L Ed 608. U.S. v. Holtzman, 762 F.2d 720 (9th Cir. 1985)

A void judgment does not create any binding obligation. Federal decisions addressing void state court judgments include Kalb v. Feuerstein (1940) 308 US 433, 60 S Ct 343, 84 L Ed 370.

Hagans v Lavine 415 U.S. 533.,

There is no discretion to ignore lack of jurisdiction. Joyce v U.S. 474 2d 215; The law provides that once State and Federal jurisdiction have been challenged, it must be proven. Main v Thiboutot 100. S. Ct 2501 (1980); " Jurisdiction can be challenged at any time " and "jurisdiction, once challenged, cannot be assumed and must be decided". Basso v Utah Power and Light Co. 495 F.2d 906,910.

When acting to enforce a statute and its subsequent amendments to the present date, the judge of the municipal court is acting as an administrative officer and not in a judicial capacity; courts in administering or enforcing statutes do not act judicially, but merely ministerially". **Thompson v. Smith, 154 SE 583.**

"Ministerial officers are incompetent to receive grants of judicial power from the legislature, their acts in attempting to exercise such powers are necessarily nullities." **Burns v. Sup., Ct., SF, 140 Cal. 1.**

4. Cannot claim Immunity

"Officers of the court have no immunity, when violating a Constitutional right, from liability. For they are deemed to know the law." **Owen v. Independence, 100 S.C.T. 1398, 445 US 622.**

ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSITION OF LAW

Proposition of Law No.I: IV Bill of Rights of the American Constitution
1791. The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

The Law affirms there must be probable cause to lawfully launch an investigation and all parties must be notified, this applying only to issues of commerce. No one is authorized to go on a fishing expedition in order to generate revenue. The hired employee of the corporation stated for the record he was conducting a random check therefore never showing any reasonable and articulable suspicion since I was not committing a crime. By "random check" it can only be a "safety check" of which I am under no obligation to be a party to. See *United States v. Herrea*, F. 3d 05- 3057 (10th Cir. (Kan.) Apr. 19, 2006).. As a result of this unlawful stop and falsely imposing this program on me, my flesh and blood baby was viciously and forcefully

abducted, kidnapped, from me. This is not just happening to me but with other people in a private capacities for enrichments of various corporations. As a result of these business activities these employees cause reckless endangerment to man, women, and child. I was terrified to the point where I and my baby were in fear for my life by people who allege to protect the people using a Federal program to violate the peoples liberty. Everything presented raises substantial constitutional questions. The decisions offends the unalienable / inalienable right of the people to travel, to self-determination, to associate and disassociate, and most importantly right of due process of law.

If allowed to stand, the decision of the court of appeals would allow employees of private corporation(Hamilton County), private contractors(Elmwood Place Police department and Hamilton County Jobs and Family Services), the right to violate the constitution indirectly with impunity. It will allow these employees by their discretion to turn all constitutional rights into crimes Simmons v. United States, 390 U.S. 377 (1968) "The claim and exercise of a Constitution right cannot be converted into a crime"... "A denial of them would be a denial of due process of law". It will allow Private Corporation to imposed fines, penalties, kidnapping and jail time because of one exercising of constitutional rights Sherar v. Cullen, 481 F. 2d 946 (1973) . It will allow any corporate employee to claim jurisdiction over any free natural person, over any matter of their lives with force without having to show proper delegation of authority.

If the decisions of this appeal court was to stand it would allow all the people to be randomly, harassed, randomly check by employees of private contractors (Elmwood Place Police Department) without authority and then, the employee will be protected. This Court must grant the petition for certiorari hear and review this case.

"Travel is not a privilege requiring, licensing, vehicle registration, or forced insurances." Chicago coach co. v. city of Chicago 227 III. 200, 169 N.E. 22.

"Constitutional 'rights' would be of little value if they could be indirectly denied." Gomillion v. Lightfoot, 364 U.S. 155 (1966), cited also in Smith v. Allwright, 321 U.S. 649.644.

This case is very important because it affect every municipal entity on the American Soil and touches the lives of all people in a private capacity traveling in there personal property being harassed, stalked, forced off the road and sometimes even murdered. In my case my flesh and blood baby was viciously ripped from me, kidnap, as a result of these false alleged traffic stop by employees of hired private contractors who are suppose to administer a federal program for the protection of people against those engaged in commerce.

The decisions of the Administrative Judge of the court of appeals has great general significance because it is contrary to the Federal Program as well as the American Constitution 1791 in that it gives employees of a contracted corporation the power to inflict injury on all people randomly void of law or the proper administration of a federal program.

It allows the employees of a contracted corporation to make and impose judicial authority where they have none and can violate the unalienable inalienable liberties of the people at their pleasure for financial gain.

“The child is not the mere creature of the State; those who nurture him and direct his destiny have the right, coupled with the high duty, to recognize and prepare him for additional obligations.” (Pierce v. Society of Sisters, 268 U.S. 510 (1925))

“It is cardinal with us that the custody, care and nurture of the child reside first in the parents, whose primary function and freedom include preparation for obligations the state can neither supply nor hinder. . . . It is in recognition of this that these decisions have respected the private realm of family life which the state cannot enter.” Pierce v. Society of Sisters, 268 U.S. 510 (1925)

“We have recognized on numerous occasions that the relationship between parent and child is constitutionally protected.” 431 U.S. 816 (1977)

“Indigenous peoples have the right to determine their own identity or membership in accordance with their customs and traditions. This does not impair the right of indigenous individuals to obtain citizenship of the States in which they live.” Article 33 (1).

2. Indigenous peoples have the collective right to live in freedom, peace and security as distinct peoples and shall not be subjected to any act of genocide or any other act of violence, including forcibly removing children of the group to another group. (Article 7)

For the reasons discussed above but not limited to, this case involves matters of public and great general interest for the protection of all people in their private capacity void of any acts of commerce.

CONCLUSION

The writ of certiorari issued to review the judgment order of the United States Court of appeals for the appeals for the sixth Should Be granted

Respectfully submitted,

Jayen By all reason please

Date: August 16, 2018