

No.

18-6607

ORIGINAL

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Supreme Court, U.S.

FILED

OCT 09 2018

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

SCOTT PETERS

- PETITIONER

VS.

JOHN BALDWIN ET. AL. - Respondant(s)

PREPARED BY

SCOTT PETERS

MS2851

P.O. Box 1000

MENARD, ILLINOIS

62259

ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED

LIST OF PARTIES

- [] All PARTIES APPEAR IN THE CAPTION OF THE CASE ON THE COVER PAGE
- [X] 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:

- 1.) UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
- 2.) DR. DAVID SHULKIN, Director
- 3.) ROBERT McDONALD, Director
- 4.) DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS
- 5.) Lynette J Taylor, Director
- 6.) EDWARD Helms JR. VETERANS HOSPITAL
- 7.) JOHN BALDWIN, Director
- 8.) ILLINOIS DEPTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
- 9.) GOVORER BRUCE RAVNER, State of ILLINOIS

JURISDICTION

THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES IS THE HIGHEST AUTHORITY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. ALL OF THESE ENTITIES ARE SUBJECT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA WHICH IS ENFORCED BY THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT, AND JUSTICES.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- 1.) THE DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS STATES PLAINTIFF CANNOT SUE THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL WRONGS AGAINST HIM FOR DELIBERATE INDIFFERENCE OR 14TH AMENDMENT VIOLATIONS, UNDER 28 USC 1331? (SEE EXHIBIT 1)
- 2.) THE DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS STATES PLAINTIFF CANNOT SUE THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FOR CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATIONS OF DELIBERATE INDIFFERENCE OR 14TH AMENDMENT VIOLATIONS, OR TORT CLAIMS, UNDER 28 USC 1331 OR 1343 (a) (3) (SEE EXHIBIT 1)
- 3.) THE DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS STATES PLAINTIFF CANNOT SUE LYNETTE J. TAYLOR OR EDWARD HEINES JR VETERANS HOSPITAL of which she IS DIRECTOR, FOR DELIBERATE INDIFFERENCE OR 14TH AMENDMENT VIOLATIONS OR TORT CLAIMS, UNDER 28 USC 1331? (SEE EXHIBIT 1)
- 4.) THE DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS SAYS I CANNOT SUE GOVONER BRUCE RAUNER who IS IN CHARGE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS AND SIGNS OFF ON THE POLICIES, PROCEDURES AND CUSTOMS OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, INCLUDING UPON INFORMATION AND BELIEF OF THE ILVAME (ILLINOIS VETERANS MEDICAL CENTERS) AND THE ILLINOIS LAW ENFORCEMENT, TO ENFORCE THESE POLICIES, PROCEDURES AND CUSTOMS (SEE EXHIBIT 1)
- 5.) CAN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT NOT ALLOW ME TO APPEAL BECAUSE I'M INDIGENT AND HAVE NO MONEY AND THEN CHARGE ME THE AMOUNT DUE FOR AN APPEAL I NEVER HAD OR WAS ABLE TO PAY FOR. (SEE EXHIBIT 2)

(SEE ALL EXHIBITS)

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

1.) UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

1ST AMENDMENT

2.) UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

4TH AMENDMENT

3.) UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

8TH AMENDMENT

4.) UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

14TH AMENDMENT

5.) FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE

TORT CLAIM LAW ACT

6.) UNITED STATES CODE

28 USC 1331

7.) UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE VI

8.) STATE OF ILLINOIS

PUBLIC ACT

9.) UNITED STATES CODE

18 USC § 3626(a)(i)(b)(i)(ii)(iii)

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

McDONALD V. UNITED STATES	69 S. Ct. 191
SULKOWSKA V. City of New York	129 F. Supp. 2d 274 (S.D.N.Y. 2001)
DEAN V. City of Worcester	924 F.2d 364, 369 (1st Cir. 1991)
DEGENOVA V. Sheriff of DuPage County	209 F.3d 973 (7th Cir. 2000)
BAUGH V. Taylor	117 F.3d 197 (5th Cir. 1997)
DUGAN V. Rank	83 S. Ct. 999 (1963)
B.K. INSTRUMENT IN. VS. UNITED STATES	715 F.2d 713 (1983)

STATUTES AND RULES

OTHER

STATEMENT OF CASE

THE CASE COMING TO BE HEARD BEFORE THE COURT IS OVERALL
VERY SIMPLE. WHETHER OR NOT THE DISTRICT JUDGE OF THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT
ERRED IN DENYING PLAINTIFFS CLAIMS AGAINST THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS
AFFAIRS, THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ITS DIRECTORS, THE HOSPITAL DELIVERING
THE MENTAL AND MEDICAL CARE, ITS DIRECTOR AND THE GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF
ILLINOIS WHOSE AGENTS CAUSED THE SITUATION. THE PLAINTIFF BEING A 100% DISABLED
PHYSICALLY VETERAN AND 70% DISABLED MENTALLY. AND WAS PRIOR TO THIS SITUATION ACCUSED
OF HAVING A MENTAL CONDITION BY THE AGENTS OF THE STATE, SHOULD HAVE KNOWN ABOUT
THE WRONG, BUT DID NOT TRY TO STOP OR FIX IT. (SEE EXHIBIT 1) THE PLAINTIFF
ACCUSATIONS ARE MADE KNOWN IN THE ORIGINAL COMPLAINT (SEE EXHIBIT 1) THAT HE
SUFFERS FROM HIS SERVICE AND TRAINING IN COMBAT ARMS MOS OF THE UNITED
STATES ARMY, JOINED THE MILITARY AT 17 1/2 EARLY IN HIS LIFE, WAS NEVER IN
TROUBLE AS A JUVENILE, HAS NO RECORD AS A JUVENILE, WAS IN A TERRIBLE INCIDENT
WHERE HIS COMBAT SCOUT VEHICLE CRASHED HIM. BARELY FINISHED HIS SERVICE, AND LEFT
HONORABLY, HOWEVER AFTER LEAVING WAS NEVER THE SAME AND WAS APPARENTLY
PERCEIVED AS A THREAT BECAUSE OF HIS TYPE OF SERVICE IN COMBAT ARMS, HAD SOME
MISDEMEANOR INCIDENTS ONLY UNTILL THIS INCIDENT WHICH PLAINTIFF ASSERTS HIS
ACTUAL INNOCENCE AND BELIEVES WAS CREATED ON HIS PART BY MISTAKE AND CAN
SHOW IT. HOWEVER, PLAINTIFF ALSO BELIEVES THAT HIS TRAINING AND MENTAL TRAINING
SPECIFICALLY CAUSED AUTOMATISM IN THE INCIDENTS THROUGHOUT HIS LIFE, AND
CREATED HIS MENTAL INSTABILITY AS HIS MIND AND BODY GET OLDER IT DEGENERATES
INCREASES. AND HE WAS NOT RECEIVING THE PROPER HELP NEEDED FROM THE
VETERANS ADMINISTRATION, ITS HOSPITALS, THE STATE, OR THE UNITED STATES. AND
BECAUSE OF THIS ITS TAKEN THE HOME IN FORECLOSURE HE AND HIS WIFE FOUGHT FOR AND
HE BELIEVES HAS DONE IRREPARABLE HARM TO HIS DAUGHTER, WHO AFTER THE
INCIDENT WENT FROM HAPPY 10 YEAR OLD GIRL TO TRANSGENDER, WHO'S WIFE IS
DISTANT AND SUFFERING SEVERE DEPRESSION AND INSTABILITY AND HAS DESTROYED
HIS ENTIRE WELLBEING AND MENTAL AND PHYSICAL DEGENERATION CONTINUES WITH
NO HELP FROM ANYONE SURROUNDING HIM, ACTUALLY ITS GOTTEN WORSE
AS THEY HAVE TAKEN HIS MEDICATIONS FOR CHRONIC PAIN AND HIS MENTAL
HEALTH MEDICATIONS FOR P.T.S.D AND MANIC DEPRESSIVE DISORDER AND
CONTINUE TO SUFFER AND PLAINTIFFS DISABILITIES ARE SERVICE CONNECTED
AND BELIEVES THIS IS THE DAMAGES DONE TO HIM AND IT REQUIRES
RELIEF FOR THOSE DAMAGES AND THE COURT ERRED DISMISSING IT, AS HE
HAS BEEN NEGLECTED NOW AND FOR YEARS. (SEE AN EXHIBIT

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

- 1.) Plaintiff Believes THE Federal District Court And Appellate Court HAD JURISDICTION UNDER THE FEDERAL QUESTION 28 USC 1331 OR OTHERS cited.
- 2.) Plaintiff Believes He stated a claim that Requires Relief For The DAMAGES caused to Him AND His complaint should have progressed FOR FAILURE TO PROVIDE MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES CREATING REASON FOR HIS INCARCERATION.
- 3.) Plaintiff's opinion is that His claim should progress He \$505.00 TAKEN FOR NOTHING should be refunded AND the case AT LEAST Remanded Because it was not handled correctly.

(SEE ALL EXHIBITS)

CONCLUSION

THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI SHOULD BE GRANTED.

Respectfully Submitted,

John R. [Signature]

DATE 9 OCTOBER 2018