

PROVIDED BY
LIBERTY CI
APR 08 2019
FOR MAILING

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1. Did the United States Supreme Court violate Petitioner's right to Due Process under the Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution and Articles 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 19, 28, and 30 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; U.D.H.R., G.A. Res. 217 A. (III), U.N. Doc. A/810 (1948).

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. George Washington University % Thomas Menabren, 1 South St. 20 Fl. Baltimore, Md. 21202
2. George Washington University Hospital % Thomas Menabren, 1 So. St. 20 Fl. Baltimore Md. 21202
3. Georgetown University % Legal Counsel 37th Dist N.W. Washington, D.C. 20057
4. Georgetown University Hospital % William Nussbaum 1919 Penn. Ave N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006
5. MedStar Georgetown Hospital % Legal Counsel 900 Reservoir Rd. Washington, D.C. 20057
6. Federal Bureau of Investigation, % Solicitor Gen. Rm 5616 450 Penn. Ave. N.W. Washington DC 20530
7. United States Capitol Police, % Solicitor Gen. Rm 5616 450 Penn. Ave. N.W. Washington, D.C. 20530
8. District of Columbia, % Atty. Gen. 441 4th St. N.W. Washington, D.C. 20001
9. District of Columbia Metropolitan Police Department, % Atty. Gen. 441 4th St. N.W. Washington, D.C. 20001
10. District of Columbia Animal Shelter, % Derek Ludwig 850 10th St. N.W. Washington, D.C. 20001

Has

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3-5
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	6-8
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	9
CONCLUSION.....	10
Rule 44 Certification	11

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A - order dismissing the case, United States Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit
- order denying rehearing, United States Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit
- order dismissing the case, United States District Court for the Dist. of Columbia

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
Betty K Agencies, LTD., v. M/V Monada, 432 F.3d 1333 (11th Cir. 2005)	7
Bracey v. Crawley, 520 U.S. 899 (1997)	6
Bush v. Gore, 531 U.S. 98 (2000)	7
Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal Co., 556 U.S. 868 (2009)	6
In re. Marchison, 349 U.S. 133 (1955)	6
Turkey v. Ohio, 273 U.S. 510 (1927)	6
Republican Party of Minnesota v. White, 536 U.S. 765 (2002)	6
Wahl v. Melves, 773 F.2d 1169 (11th Cir. 2005)	7
Withrow v. Larkin, 421 U.S. 35 (1975)	6

STATUTES AND RULES

Amendment V, United States Constitution.	6
--	---

OTHER

Articles 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 19, 28, and 30 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; U.D.H.R., G.A. Res. 217A. (III), U.N. Doc. A/810 (1948).	759
--	-----

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 A 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 July 09, 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: October 17, 2018, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix A.

☐ 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).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Amendment V, U.S. Const. Am. Provides:

"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."

Article 1, U.D.H.R., G.A. Res. 217A (III), U.N. Doc. A1810 (1948) Provides:

"All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood."

Article 2, U.D.H.R., G.A. Res. 217A (III), U.N. Doc. A1810 (1948) Provides:

"Everyone is entitled to the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, color, sex, language, religion, Political or other opinion, nation or social origin, Property, birth or other Status. Furthermore, no distinction shall be made on the basis of the Political, jurisdictional or international status of the Country or territory to which a Person belongs, whether it be independent, trust, non-self-governing or under any other limitation of Sovereignty."

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Article 3, U.D.H.R., G.A. Res. 217A (III), U.N. Doc. A/1810 (1948) provides:

"Everyone has the right to life, liberty and the security of person."

Article 5, U.D.H.R., G.A. Res. 217A (III), U.N. Doc. A/1810 (1948) provides:

"No one shall be subjected to torture or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment."

Article 6, U.D.H.R., G.A. Res. 217A (III), U.N. Doc. A/1810 (1948) provides:

"Everyone has the right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law."

Article 7, U.D.H.R., G.A. Res. 217A (III), U.N. Doc. A/1810 (1948) provides:

"All are equal before the law and are entitled without discrimination to equal protection of the law. All are entitled to equal protection against any discrimination in violation of this Declaration and against any incitement to such discrimination."

Article 8, U.D.H.R., G.A. Res. 217A (III), U.N. Doc. A/1810 (1948) provides:

"Everyone has the right to an effective remedy by the competent national tribunals for acts violating the fundamental rights granted him by the Constitution or by law."

Article 9, U.D.H.R., G.A. Res. 217A (III), U.N. Doc. A/1810 (1948) provides:

"No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention or exile."

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Article 10, U.D.H.R., G.A. Res. 217A (III), U.N. Doc. A/810 Provides:

"Everyone is entitled to full equality to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, in the determination of his rights and obligations and of any criminal charge against him."

Article 12, U.D.H.R., G.A. Res. 217A (III), U.N. Doc. A/810 (1948) Provides:

"No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence, nor to attacks upon his honour and reputation. Everyone has the right to the protection of the law against such interference or attacks."

Article 19, U.D.H.R., G.A. Res. 217A (III), U.N. Doc. A/810 (1948) Provides:

"Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers."

Article 28, U.D.H.R., G.A. Res. 217A (III), U.N. Doc. A/810 (1948) Provides:

"Everyone is entitled to a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration can be fully realized."

Article 30, U.D.H.R., G.A. Res. 217A (III), U.N. Doc. A/810 (1948) Provides:

"Nothing in this Declaration may be interpreted as implying for any State, group, or person any right to engage in any activity or to perform any act aimed at the destruction of any of the rights and freedoms set forth herein" 5.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Petitioner, Stephen D. Leonard, is a pro-se litigant seeking to hold these respondents to account for violations of clearly established laws and Constitutional rights of the Petitioner, Pursuant to the rules and procedures established by this Court. See Art. III, U.S. Const.; See also Art. VI, U.S. Const.; U.S. Const. Am. V.

The United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and Judge Rudolph Contreras violated Petitioner's rights to due process under U.S. Const. Am. V by inventing and/or making arguments on behalf of multiple L.E.O. defendants, and then arbitrarily ruling upon said arguments, closing the case and denying rehearing, in violation of this Court's holdings in Capeston v. A.T. Massey Coal Co., 556 U.S. 868, 876 (2009); In re Murchison, 349 U.S. 133, 136 (1955); Bracy v. Greiner, 520 U.S. 899, 905 (1997); Republican Party of Minnesota v. White, 536 U.S. 765, 775 (2002). "It is axiomatic that '[a] fair trial in a fair tribunal is a basic requirement of Due Process,' (quoting Capeston, 556 U.S., at 876); In re Murchison, 349 U.S., at 136.

When the District Judge "invented, and/or made arguments" on behalf of the L.E.O. defendants; (F.B.I., U.S. Capitol Police, and/or D.C. Metro P.D.), the Judge crossed the line of neutrality, becoming bias, prejudicing Petitioner's legal rights and claims in effort to cover-up the illegal acts of these defendants and/or to cover-up the fact that Judge Contreras "regularly ruled in favor of the defendants and/or defendant's counsels". See Bracy, 520 U.S., at 905. See also Turney v. Ohio, 273 U.S. 510, 532 (1927); Withrow v. Larkin, 421 U.S. 35, 47 (1975) ("These are circumstances 'in which experience teaches that the probability of actual bias on the part of the Judge or decisionmaker is too high to be Constitutionally tolerable.'") (quoting Capeston, 556 U.S., at 877).

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Petitioner raised these claims on appeal in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, citing violations of Due Process, and failure of the United States to afford this Petitioner a Fair Hearing by an Impartial Adjudicator. Then Judge, now Justice Kavanaugh, participated in dismissing the case to help Judge Contreras cover up the violations of Due Process. (See attached Order Appendix A, July 09, 2018). See also Bush V. Gore, 531 U.S. 98, 111 (2000) (per curiam) (When Contending Parties invoke the process of the Courts, however, it becomes our unsought responsibility to resolve the Federal and Constitutional issues the judicial System has been forced to confront.")

Here, as in Bush V. Gore, Petitioner invoked and sought the Courts "responsibility to resolve the Federal and Constitutional issues", however, the United States Courts have failed to "uphold the laws, and Constitution, and Treaties" of the United States, in a fashion inconsistent with the Customs, Policies and Procedures it claims to represent. See Article's 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 19, 28, and 30 of the U.S. Constitution. See also Art. VI § 2, U.S. Const.

When a Citizen, or Person, within the United States petitions the United States of America to hear a grievance, and/or address a Complaint, concerning unlawful Conduct by its Employees; more specifically, Civil and Criminal violations of Federal laws and International Treaties, the least the Courts can do is allow a Civil litigant, Pro se or otherwise, to have his or her day in Court; Wahl V. Melver, 773 F.2d 1169, 1174 (11th Cir. 1985); Betty K Agencies, LTD. V. MIV Monader, 432 F.3d 1333, 1337-39 (11th Cir. 2005), and refer the Criminal Matters to the United States Attorney for Prosecutorial Merits.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Here in the instant proceeding, Petitioner filed a Petition for writ of Certiorari to this Court, Cited to U.S. Constitution and the Treaties that were violated, however, for whatever reason, or no apparent reason, this Court has denied the Petitioner a Fair Hearing upon the Violations of Domestic and International Laws.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

1. The Petitioner should be given a Full and Fair Hearing.
2. The Violations of Due Process under Am. V, U.S.C.A., and Articles 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 19, 28, and 30 of the U.D.H.R. Requires a judicial Review.
3. A Fundamental miscarriage of justice will occur if this Court neglects its duties to the United States Constitution and Treaties ratified under the authority of the United States by denying rehearing to address violations of laws by its own Members (Kavanaugh) and jurists.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

SL

Date: April 08, 2019