

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

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Bobbie J. Adams — PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

vs.

Netflix — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

United States Court of Appeals, Second Cir.  
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Bobbie J. Adams  
(Your Name)

113 Oneida St.  
(Address)

Notwich, Ct. 06360  
(City, State, Zip Code)

860-319-3573  
(Phone Number)

## Questions Presented

1. Does a federal court have jurisdiction to review the laws passed by Congress... when the record before them clearly shows the "use" conflicts with "the intent" of Congress.
2. Should a pro se., litigant be held to a higher standard than the five points recognized by this court to prove fraud.
3. Should a pro se., senior citizen, be allowed to present expert testimony in federal court to justify monetary relief requested... before the court rules on that issue.
4. Should the constitutional rights of a pro se., senior citizen be suspended in light of a law passed by Congress... even though that law has "nothing" to do with the circumstances of this case.

## 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:

Netflix, LLC.

2020 Court of Appeals Division 1

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                                        |       |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| OPINIONS BELOW.....                                    | 12    |
| JURISDICTION.....                                      | 13    |
| CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED ..... | 14    |
| STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....                            | 15-18 |
| REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT .....                    | 19-24 |
| CONCLUSION.....                                        | 25-26 |

*Motion For Appointment of Counsel - 21.*

## INDEX TO APPENDICES

|            |                                                          |       |
|------------|----------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| APPENDIX A | <i>Summary Order</i>                                     | 29-31 |
|            | <i>General Docket</i>                                    | 32-36 |
| APPENDIX B | <i>Order granting leave to Proceed in Forma Pauperis</i> | 39    |
|            | <i>but dismissing the action;</i>                        |       |
| APPENDIX C | <i>Recommended Ruling,</i>                               | 40-44 |

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

Table of Authorities Cited

1. *Gonley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 47, 1957. Page 25

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

**OPINIONS BELOW**

[ ] For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix A to the petition and is

[ ] reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
[ ] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
 is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix B to the petition and is

[ ] reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
[ ] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
 is unpublished.

For cases from **state courts**:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_ to the petition and is

[ ] reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
[ ] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
[ ] is unpublished.

The opinion of the \_\_\_\_\_ court appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_ to the petition and is

[ ] reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
[ ] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
[ ] is unpublished.

## JURISDICTION

[ ] For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was 6-7-2018.

No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: \_\_\_\_\_, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_.  
 An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including \_\_\_\_\_ (date) on \_\_\_\_\_ (date) in Application No. \_\_A\_\_\_\_\_.  
The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1254(1).

For cases from **state courts**:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was \_\_\_\_\_.  
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_.  
[ ] A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: \_\_\_\_\_, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_.  
[ ] An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including \_\_\_\_\_ (date) on \_\_\_\_\_ (date) in Application No. \_\_A\_\_\_\_\_.  
The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).

— Constitution and Statutory Provisions Involved —

15 U.S.C. § 1601

## — Statement of the Case —

1. At one time petitioner had people living in his house and ordered the services of the respondent.
2. Kept said services for about two years and respondent received their payment every month from his checking account (automatically), they always got their money, no problem.
3. When the people staying with petitioner moved out, he cancelled both the internet and the services of the respondent.
4. Some months later, he received an overdraft notice from the bank. Went to the bank reviewed the records with them, discovered the respondent had started again withdrawing

monies from his account. The bank called them and through bank records, it was established when the internet and their service was cancelled.

This was a (45) minute recorded conversation, wherein,

- a) they acknowledged petitioner had not request service.
- b) assured him it would not happen again.
- c) returned his monies to the bank.
- d) any reasonable person would consider the respondents actions a mistake.

Petitioner did also even though he does not have that mindset.

5. Some months passed and here we go again, the overdraft notice, the long conversation

with the bank and respondent (recorded).

However, this time respondent chose to tell the bank and petitioner that because the mistake had taken more than (60) days to discover... they get to keep the money. Even after acknowledging from their records that petitioner had not requested the service. This action followed as a matter of right to request a federal court to stop them from using 15 U.S. § 1601, in a manner congress had not intended the law to be used.

6. Petitioner argued that the federal courts have jurisdiction on so many levels. The federal courts have original jurisdiction, diversity jurisdiction, federal question jurisdiction, and above all constitutional jurisdiction.

7. Petitioner argued that the constitutional minimum is 20 dollars.

As to the 75.000 dollar minimum ... petitioner has been classified, Paranoid-schizophrenic with homicidal ideations for over 50 years. The expert testimony would entitle petitioner to far more.

Respondent tried to settle for 2.500 dollars, yet they have no idea how important the constitutional rights are to the petitioner or the effect of anyone taking something from him affects his mind, as well as those constitutional rights.

## Lessons for Drafting the Suit

Petitioner has cited a number of cases in support of his complaint. The only constitutional guarantee that has been upheld thus far is the granting of former spouse status.

The constitution petitioner speaks of allows him to sue if a party unlawfully deprives him of twenty dollars or more. That constitution also allows a reasonable person to claim this is an act of cruel and unusual punishment when it's done the second time.

Within that constitution petitioner also has a right to due process and equal protection, which he did not surrender when he became a senior citizen and the taking of his money "without" contractual or any other legal cause violates that.

To use a federal law as a shield to hide behind while doing so, violates every aspect of these constitutional guarantees - unless Congress intended 15 US § 1601, to be such a shield.

The retaining of ones financial information allowed the respondent to twice open an account that was closed after the first time petitioner had a verbal "recorded" guarantee from respondent, that they would delete said financial information. "NO ONE" should believe that petitioner is the "Only Senior Litigant" this is being done to.

Like petitioner most senior citizens only open/check their utility bill, as its the only one that fluctuates.

Herein, petitioner respectfully moves this court "without" citing laws to the highest law-makers of this land to render a common-sense order.

Petitioner, is not an attorney, but goes with (seemingly forever), and would pray this court allow him to express the common-sense justice he is seeking as guaranteed by that constitution, that should be squarely handled to every soul in America, in a short story he wrote for this occasion.

## What Did You Do -

There were two men in a house, working on fixing it up. And it started to thunder and storm and the rain came down by buckets. And one man said to the other, "you shall be soaking wet before we get home." And the second man replied, "Jesus, said if you have faith the size of a mustard seed, you can do the things I do and greater." And the first man smiled and replied, well go along "I" have a few things to grab. Then the second man opened the door and stepped out into the storm.

Minutes later the other man left the house they had been working on, seemingly like forever, and stepped out into the storm. And with a brisk and direct step soon caught up to the other man and said to him, see you are still waiting on your faith to keep you dry, but I knew you would be soaking wet again. And the second man said, let's see how you fair.

After awhile they arrived at a dinner, one they had chosen to eat at every night on their way "home" from working on the house, they were fixing up.

Upon stepping inside, the first man said to the other, "just as I expected, you're soaking wet again." And the second man replied, "still on my mustard seed size". And as the first man stood there closing up his umbrella, folding up his rain hat and coat, the second man was off to the restroom to wring his clothes out - again.

Finally, both of them, sat at a table that they had jokingly named.. "what did you order". A waitress whom had seemingly been waiting on them forever came, excuse me, was there to take their order.

And the one brother ordered a large dish of faith and laughing asked for a side dish of dry clothes. The other brother said, I'll have the platter of knowledge and understanding. The one brother asked the other, why do you always order the platter, you do see by now, it's actually the smallest dish they serve here.

And his brother replied, seemingly forever, "it's the one my ancestors taught Solomon, to ask for and seemingly forever I have <sup>been</sup> desiring nothing else, and pointed to a saggedy sign hanging on the wall over the door, they had come through seemingly forever.

And its lettering read, "Jesus, said this I tell you, be not amazed at the things I do, but know that, if you have knowledge and wisdom - less even than the size of a mustard seed, the things I do, you shall do and greater, for I only do what's necessary to be what I am. Because seemingly forever I have felt I am, what I am. The sisters, smiled and enjoyed their meal before they continued their journey home.

One of the morals of this story, (not the most important one), is that each and everyone of you "are your brother's keeper", moreso than any judge in this land; what you, Jordan - we, consequently eat that as well. The actions of this court, based on knowledge and understanding would definitely sit better on the stomachs of the elderly.

— Conclusion —

Herein the petitioner has referred to the mentality used by framers of the United States Constitution who in their wisdom, knowing this controlling document, (not 15 U.S. § 1601) had to stand as their brothers keeper, "all of the brothers", and guaranteed us the right to order "a large dish of faith" -

That is not what petitioner is seeking, but rather the other guarantees of that same constitution.

Whereas the one case petitioner cites is Gonley v. Gibson, 355 U.S. 41, 47, 1957.

Since 15 years of age, he has been 5'11", 178-180. Since and during the times mentioned herein he has lost over 50 pounds, suffers, daily nightmares, has been checked for cancer three times, S.T.D. twice, diabetes twice... all came back negative.

Petitioner has been classified as paranoid schiz.-chronic with homicidal ideations for over 50 years, during times mentioned herein his medications have had to be doubled and others added.

Because of all this and more, he request this court to allow him to amend the monetary relief requested from \$75.020.16<sup>6</sup> to \$7500.020.16<sup>6</sup> The writ should be granted.

Respectfully Submitted  
Bobbie L. Adams  
Bobbie L. Adams  
113 Waco St.  
Norwich, Ct. 06360  
(860-319-3573)