

No. 18-15620

1:18-cv-00181-LJO-8KD

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

FROM CALIFORNIA STATE

ZANE HUBBARD — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

VS.

EDMUND G. BROWN JR., ET AL. — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS, FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT - CALIFORNIA
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

ZANE HUBBARD, COCR #: F48741
(Your Name)

POST OFFICE BOX 3476
(Address)

CORCORAN, CALIFORNIA, 93212
(City, State, Zip Code)

(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

(1). IN CONTROVERSIES INVOLVING TREASON AND LEVY BY THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AND WITHIN ONE STATE WITH STATE GOVERNMENT AGAINST ONE OR MORE OF ITS PEOPLE, WHOSE JURISDICTION IS IT, TO EXERCISE JUDICIAL POWER BY THE CONSTITUTION(S) BY ADHERING TO THE AGGRIEVED (?)

(2). STATE AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAVE UNREASONABLY DELAYED OR DENIED RELIEF TO ME. THE GOVERNMENT WILL CONTINUE TO PREJUDICE MY ABILITY TO OBTAIN RELIEF, IF FULL AND FAIR ACTION IS NOT ACCORDED PURSUANT TO CONSTITUTIONAL OBLIGATION(S). WHERE MY ABILITY TO MEET TECHNICAL REQUIREMENT(S) FOR REVIEW IN COURT ARE INCAPACITATED BY MALICIOUS GOVERNMENT, HOW WILL I BE AFFORDED A FULL AND FAIR JURY TRIAL TO GRIEVE THE WRONG(S) BEING COMMITTED (?)

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:

(1). *JORGE MARIO BERGOGLIO (POPE FRANCIS)* ;

(2). *THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA* ;

(3). *THE STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE ACT OF 1984* ;

(4). *BARACK OBAMA* ;

(5). *GEORGE W. H. BUSH* ;

(6). *JOSEPH BIDEN* .

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....	1
JURISDICTION.....	(8), (9)
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	(6), (7)
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	(10), (11), (12)
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	(13), (14), (15)
CONCLUSION.....	(15)

INDEX TO APPENDICES

- APPENDIX A - *KERN COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, 2-17-2017, COURT OPINION.*
- APPENDIX B - *FIFTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF CALIFORNIA, 5-25-2017, COURT OPINION.*
- APPENDIX C - *SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA, 1-10-2018, COURT OPINION.*
- APPENDIX D - *UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE 9TH CIRCUIT 11-5-2018, COURT OPINION.*
- APPENDIX E - *UNITED STATES EASTERN DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA, 3-29-2018, COURT OPINION.*
- APPENDIX F - *UNITED STATES JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE 9TH CIRCUIT, 9-28-2018, COURT OPINION.*

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

MONROE V. PAPER (1961) 365 U.S. 167, (13)

STATUTES AND RULES

TITLE 42, UNITED STATES CODE ACT, SECTION 1985, (13)

TITLE 42, UNITED STATES CODE ACT, SECTION 1986, (13)

OTHER

ZANE HUBBARD V. CONNIE GIBSON (U.S.E.D. CALIFORNIA) 1:13 CV 01758-LJO-JLT, (11)

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 (D) 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 (E) 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 (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 COURT OF APPEALS, CALIFORNIA FIFTH DISTRICT court appears at Appendix (E) 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 SEPTEMBER 28TH, 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: JULY 10TH, 2018, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix (F).

☐ 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 1-10-2018. A copy of that decision appears at Appendix (C).

☐ 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

United States Constitution Article II, Section (1), Subsection (8),

(14)

United States Constitution Article III, Section (2),

(13)

United States Constitution Article III, Section (3), Subsection (1),

(14)

United States Constitution Article III, Section (3), Subsection (2),

(14)

United States Constitution Article IV, Section (2), Subsection (1),

(13)

United States Constitution Article IV, Section (4),

(13)

United States Constitution Article VII, Section (1),

(13)

United States Constitution Article VII, Section (2),

(14)

United States Constitution Bill Of Rights Amendment XI

(13)

United States Constitution Bill Of Rights Amendment XIV,

(13)

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS CONTINUED

UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION ARTICLE XIV, SECTION (4), . . .

(13)

CALIFORNIA'S CONSTITUTION ARTICLE (I), SECTION (I), . . . (13)

CALIFORNIA'S CONSTITUTION ARTICLE (I), SECTION (18), . . . (14)

CALIFORNIA'S CONSTITUTION ARTICLE III, SECTION (I), . . . (14)

CALIFORNIA'S CONSTITUTION ARTICLE III, SECTION (5), . . . (13)

CALIFORNIA'S CONSTITUTION ARTICLE III, SECTION (6), SUBSECTION (d), . . . (13)

CALIFORNIA'S CONSTITUTION ARTICLE VI, SECTION (12), . . .

(13)

CALIFORNIA'S CONSTITUTION ARTICLE XX, SECTION (3), . . .

(14)

(7)

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The Catholic Church Are Practicing Scientology In A Manner Described As Discrimination And Preferential Treatment Without And Against Religious Jurisdiction, And In Violation Of Various Laws; Internationally And Nationally.

These Exploits Are Publicly Known, And Have Been Taking Place For Over (500) Years. Specifically, The Catholic Church Is Responsible For The Exploitation And Repression Of Americans On The Account Of Race, Religion, And, Identity; Not Because Of An Educated Attempt At Scientology, But Because Of An Uneducated, Assentimented, MISINTERPRETATION OF THE SOURCE.

The Catholic Church Is Discriminating Particularly On South And Central Americans) Expelling Us North Into The United States And California Seeking Refuge.

In Response To The Crisis, The United States Government Rather Than Addressing The Problem (The Roman Catholic Church) Have Developed A Technique For Low Intensity Warfare; Entraping, Displacing, Murdering, And Expatriating Many; Using Various U.S. A. Acts, Treaties, And Statutes That Conflict With U.S. And States) Constitutional Prohibitions.

Many Government Believe They Are Aiding Religious Demands

OR ARE UNAWARE HOW TO CHALLENGE THE WELL ESTABLISHED CHURCH,
NOT UNDERSTANDING THAT THE CATHOLIC CHURCH HAS BEEN WRONG
FOR (1) OR (2) THOUSAND YEARS, BECAUSE OF THIS COMMON ERROR
OF UNDERSTANDING.

MORE RECENTLY IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, IN AND OF THE CATHOLIC
CHURCHES) EXPLOITS, AT AN ATTEMPT TO MAINTAIN ECONOMIC
STABILITY AND CONTINUING STATE GOALS, GOVERNOR EDWARD G.
BROWN JUNIOR HAS SUSPENDED THE FUNCTIONS OF THE STATE
AND CALLED FORTH THE MILITIA DECLARING WARR ON CRIME.

INNOCENT CIVILIANS ARE IMPACTED CLAIMING THAT IMMIGRATION IS
A CRIME.

AS A RESULT, I (VE) BEEN TARGETED FOR DISCRIMINATION, STARTING
IN 2010 IN BAKERSFIELD, CALIFORNIA, I WAS CONTEMPTUOUSLY
PUNISHED AND FAIRLY IMPRISONED LEADING TO ENTRAPMENT FOR A
SERIES OF FELONIES STEMMING FROM ONE SINGLE EVENT.

HAVING EXHAUSTED STATE REMEDIES, MY CRIMINAL APPEAL HAS
REMAINED PENDING FOR APPROXIMATELY (6) YEARS IN THE U.S.
EASTERN DISTRICT COURT OF CALIFORNIA (HARRIS V. GIBSON
1:13 CV 01758-LJO-JLT) THE LAST ORDER WAS AN ORDER TO SHOW
CAUSE TO ME AS TO WHY MY CASE SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED
IN WHICH I FILED OBJECTIONS TO ON SEPTEMBER 29TH, 2016
WHICH HAS REMAINED UNANSWERED.

DUE TO DISCRIMINATION, I HAVE HAD TO FILE OVER (100) PRISON

ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL STATE COMPLAINTS (CHALLENGING LIFE,
LIBERTY, AND PROPERTY DEPRIVATIONS THAT ARE UNLAWFULLY DEPRIVED
DENIED, OR UNRESOLVED.

OVER (100) STATE AND FEDERAL WRITERS THAT ARE ALL DENIED
REGARDING COMPLETELY DIFFERENT ISSUES INCLUDING MY CONVICTION.

I HAVE ALSO EXHAUSTED 'EVERY' CITY, COUNTY, AND STATE
REMOVED IN KERN, KINGS, AND SACRAMENTO COUNTIES, TO NO
AVAIL.

ACCORDINGLY I SUFFER/REPARABLE HARM AS A RESULT OF
DISCRIMINATION, FALSE IMPRISONMENT, AND CONDITIONS OF CONFINEMENT

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

SUITS MAY BE BROUGHT AGAINST THE STATE IN SUCH MANNER AND IN SUCH COURTS AS SHALL BE DIRECTED BY LAW BY ANY PERSON WHO IS A RESIDENT OF OR DOING BUSINESS IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

(CALIFORNIA'S) CONSTITUTION ARTICLE III, SECTION (5); AND, CALIFORNIA'S CONSTITUTION ARTICLE III, SECTION (6), SUBSECTION (d); UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION ARTICLE IV, SECTION (2), SUBSECTION (1); UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION ARTICLE VI, SECTION (1); AND, UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION BILL OF RIGHTS AMENDMENT XIV, SECTION (4)).

THIS COURT HAS JURISDICTION AFTER A COMPLETE EXHAUSTION OF EVERY STATE, COUNTY, CITY, AND FEDERAL REMEDY PURSUANT TO: UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION ARTICLE III, SECTION (2); AND, UNITED STATES CONSTITUTIONAL BILL OF RIGHTS AMENDMENT XI; SEE ALSO, CALIFORNIA'S CONSTITUTION ARTICLE VI, SECTION (12); TITLE 42, UNITED STATES CODE SECTION 1986; AND, TITLE 42, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 1985.

I CONTINUE TO REMAIN UNREASONABLY DETAINED DESPITE STATE, FEDERAL, AND RELIGIOUS HIERARCHY CONFLICT WITH ITS OWN LAWS AND OBLIGATIONS; REMAINING UNDER DURESS. (UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION ARTICLE IV, SECTION (4); UNITED STATES CONSTITUTIONAL BILL OF RIGHTS AMENDMENT XIV; CALIFORNIA'S CONSTITUTIONAL ARTICLE (I), SECTION (1); AND, MONROE V. PAPER (1961) 365 U.S. 167).

THERE IS NO APPARENT REASON SAVE FOR THE AID OF TREASON AND

1 Levy With And By The Catholic Church. This Violates :
2 United States Constitution Article III, Section (3),
3 Suggestion (1); And, (California) Constitution Article (1),
4 Section (18).

5
6 The Courts) Constitutional Obligation To Punish Acts Of
7 Treason And Levy Would Be Breached And Could Work
8 Corruption Of Governmental Authority, (United States
9 Constitution Article III, Section (3), Suggestion (2); United
10 States Constitution Article II, Section (1), Suggestion (8);
11 And, (California) Constitution Article XX, Section (3),
12 If The Courts Remain Negligent.

13
14 The United States Constitution(s) Are The Supreme Law
15 Of The Land. (California) Constitution Article III,
16 Section (1); United States Constitution Article II, Section (2)).

17
18 Accordingly I Am Entitled To A Full, Fair, And Speedy
19 Jury Trial. The Decision Of The Lower Courts) Denial Of
20 My Rights To An Evidentiary Hearing Or An Order To
21 Show Cause To Start A Prima Facie Claim Without Adequate
22 Assistance Or A Fair Trial Of Facts; Is Cause To Reverse
23 The Decision Of The Lower Courts) And Proof Of The Denial
24 Of My Inalienable Rights) And Protections).

25
26 Jurists) Of Reason Would Find Debatable That The
27 Extensive Media Generated Information Regarding The
28 (Catholic Church, Immigration, And Residents) Of The

STATE OF CALIFORNIA AND THE UNITED STATES ARE ADVERTISED
BECAUSE OF DISCRIMINATION AND NEGLIGENT GOVERNMENT
MISCONDUCT.

IT IS AN ISSUE OF NATIONAL CONCERN BECAUSE THIS BEHAVIOR BY
THE GOVERNMENT CAN IMPACT THE LIVES OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS
AS IT DEMONSTRATES THE GOVERNMENT'S ABUSE OF AUTHORITY.

ADDITIONALLY, THE TRIAL MUST BE USED TO SHIELD THE HARM OF
DEFAMATION DUE TO THE INTERNATIONALLY PUBLICIZED CRISIS IN SOUTH
AND CENTRAL AMERICA LEADING TO IMMIGRATION.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature, possibly reading "J. P. [unclear]", is written over a horizontal line.

Date: NOVEMBER 14TH, 2018