In the Supreme Court of the United States

No. 18 - 8823

OMER AL OBAIDY

PETITIONER

v.

KEVIN K. MCALEENAN, ACTING SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY DEPARTMENT, ET, AL

DEFENDANT

ON PETITION FOR WRITE OF CIRTIORARY TO
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
REHERAING

OMER AL OBAIDY
Flat 39
4, Great Western Street
Aylesbury
Buckinghamshire
HP20 2PL
United Kingdom
Tel: +447934847108
+441296296720
E-mail: oa68123@gmail.com
Unpresented, Pro Se

Petition of Rehearing

The Supreme Court of the U.S. has issued its denial on June 10, 2019 to the case filed with the court and docketed on April 15, 2019 No. 18 - 8823. Complying with Supreme Court Rule 44 the petitioner has right for rehearing which must be files within 25 days of date denial issued.

Questions Presented

1. Dose petitioner who have been removed on "Mandatory Detention" under 8 U.S.C. 1226(c) made regardless of petitioner clear non-criminal record and no proof of convections under 8 U.S.C. 1229a(c)(3)(B) by court of jurisdiction where removal made by falsifying record by fraud and forgery in government forms and fraudulently concealed all evidence related to removal, violate his rights under the Fourth, Fifth and the Sixth amendments based upon fourteen years of residency in the United States prior to last entry on VWP?.

2. is petitioner and based upon facts and evidence produced, eligible for removal cancelation under 8 U.S.C. 1229b(b)(1) as the stop-time rule has not been triggered nor ended where the date of removal has not been administratively final nor proven that petitioner released on the date from detention or confinement as shown on 8 U.S.C. 1231(a)(B)(i), (iii) to trigger the beginning of "Removal Period" of 90 days of which continue to exist since removal on May 1, 2003 to the present day on 8 U.S.C. 1231(a)(1)(A)?

4. is disseminating wrongful information on petitioner personal record to proceed removal as Criminal Alien stated under the Privacy Act of 1974, 5 U.S.C. 552a violating petitioner rights on Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Amendment under the "Zone of Privacy"?

5. is petitioner eligible of monetary recovery under *Bivens* which has been removed under Mandatory Detention as criminal alien by falsifying record violate his constitutional rights under the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth amendments of the United States Constitution and 42 U.S.C. 1985 (3)?

The rehearing request consists of three facts that the Court Overlooked as following

A. Constitutional and federal statutes violations

1. petitioner targeted for mandatory detention under section INA 236 coded under 8 U.S.C. 1226(c) regardless of his clear non-criminal record targeting his race and national origin by falsifying government forms by fraud and forgery. Action of removal violated his due right process secured to him in the fifth amendment provided to the state via fourteenth amendment which he possess giving his lengthy residency of fourteen years under F-1 non-immigrant visa prior of his last entry under VWP as Italian national after an absent of 19 months .

2. petitioner was subject to Mandatory detention made by ICE and the FBI-KCMO which failed to show proof of conviction as stated under 8 U.S.C. 1229a(c)(3)(B) due to petitioner clear non-criminal record.

3. petitioner removed under mandatory detention imposed upon alien under two conditions, if alien committed offence covered under 1187(a)(2) as deportable offense covered in section 1227(a)(2)(A)(ii), (A), (iii), (B), (C), (D) or deportable under 1227(a)(2)(i) based on offense of which alien has been sentenced to term of imprisonment of at least 1 year. Or second an alien inadmissible under 1187(a)(3)(B) or deportable under 1227(a)(4)(B). Immigration Customs Enforcement -KCMO failed to demonstrate with tangible evidence beyond reasonable doubt if petitioner included under the offences mentioned above. ICE and the FBI-KCMO have done this criminal act against petitioner by fraud and forgery to all legal forms to include petitioner within (Secure Community) program targeting criminal aliens regardless of his clear non-criminal record where he never served any imprisonment of any criminal act nor misdemeanor.

4. among many issued discussed on Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigration Responsibility Act 1996 is the Stop- Time Rule where give eligibility of petitioner to be included on since he is not committed any criminal act to be exempt of Stop-time rule regardless of VWP overstay since petitioner has prior lengthy legal residency which establish eligibility to include petitioner under stop-time Rule

5. As stated on 8 U.S.C. 1231(a)(1)(B)(i), and (iii) the beginning of removal period begins on the least of the following, the date the order of removal become administratively final and if the alien detained or confined (except under an immigration process), the date the alien is released from detention or confinement. None of the above mentioned has been found as there are NO criminal act been determined by court of jurisdiction where petitioner found guilty nor he has been released confinement after committed criminal act render to imprisonment due to his clear record. on the other side petitioner overstayed 150 days which is not removable office since it didn't exceed 180 days to render voluntary departure and three years band. Thus, the stop time rule has not been triggered nor ended as Place, Time and location of the criminal act has not recorded since the apprehension date where petitioner taken to ICE-KCMO custody has been changed form 04/11/2003 to 04/10/2003 and Time, Place, and location of court of jurisdiction to initiate an indictment of guilt not been found due to petitioner clear non- criminal record.

6. since there are NO indictment found to show with evidence that petitioner removed as criminal alien under 8 U.S.C. 1226(c)(2) nor found to be in violation of his VWP as overstayed time not exceed 180 days to be counted as removable offense, therefore, if finality has not determined it means that petitioner currently under removal process within 90 days and the period continue to renew itself since that date petitioner removed on May 1, 2003 to the present day as stated under 8 U.S.C. 1231(a)(1)(A).

7. VWP violators are exempt of expedited removal and if found by authorities they will be subject of prompt removal without any eligibility of review before an immigration judge. Petitioner who seek an admission to the U.S. on VWP on Sept 5, 2002 and removed on May 1, 2003 have the right to have fair review to his case under 8 U.S.C. 1229a, 1229b and 1229c including 8 U.S.C. 1252 as he possess constitutional rights provided to him based upon previous legal residency of fourteen years since 1987 to 2003 where his rights been abused under the First, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Eighth and the Fourteenth Amendment including the fact that removal violate the rights of the people of state of Missouri under the Tenth Amendment.

8. as petitioner and due to his prior lengthy legal residency with proof of education and investment with clear record he is eligible for due right process under the U.S. constitution. Therefore, and considering evidence provided to the court from local sources of the Freedom of information Act office which comply with F. R. C. P. (44) he is as well found to be eligible for removal cancelation and compensation of pain and suffering caused by removal.

B. denial of petition for writ of certiorari came in contradiction in whole or a part of many previous opinions published by the Supreme Court.

The following below list of cases discussed by the supreme court which discuss the same elements provided the petitioner case.

1. [Any noncitizen within the united states also has constitutional right to traditional standard of fairness, regardless of whether they entered the country lawfully or unlawfully]. *See Shaughnessy v. United States ex. rel. Mezei, 345 U.S. 206(1953)*. see also *London v. Plasencia, 459 U.S. 21 (1982).* [Although an alien seeking admission to the united states has no constitutional rights, once an alien begins to develop the ties to the United Sates that go with permanent residence, her constitutional status changes]. Petitioner do possess constitutional rights based upon his previous residency of 14 years regardless of his absent which cannot be easily removed of petitioner history.

2. (in deportation proceedings, the government must prove a noncitizen's by clear, convincing, and unequivocal evidence) *see Woodby v. INS, 385 U.S. 276 (1966)*. There are no proof that petitioner was criminal Alien due to lack of evidence and proof of conviction nor can proceed removal as VWP violator as the days overstayed not enough to impose voluntary departure and band of three years.

3. *see Fong Haw Tan v. Phelan, 333 U.S. 6 (1948)* [Matter of Doubt should be resolved in favor of the alien in deportation processing. Deportation statue must be narrowly constructed in favor of noncitizens]. Removal of petitioner was based upon his race and national origin as Italian national of Iraqi origin the service didn't state their reason of removal nor supported by tangible evidence that petitioner was convicted criminal alien of which crate Doubt in deportation proceeding.

4. *See Reno v. American- Arab Anti- Discrimination comm., 525 U.S. 471, 489- 92 (1999)* (finding that the INS retains inherent prosecutorial discretion as to whether to bring removal proceedings).the service didn't exercise prosecutorial discretion based on Morton memo or there was compiling factors to bring removal proceedings rather the service committed fraud and forgery in legal form to impose removal as criminal alien without conclusion of the law.

5. *Kleindienst v. Mandel, 408 U.S. 743 (1972*

It a decision of supreme court based upon visa denial where it will impact the constitutional right of the U.S. citizen of the First Amendment to challenge the consular non- reviewability doctrine where the state department to establish (facially legitimate and bona fide) which establish Mandel review. The same will be applicable to petitioner case since the denial of the case with the supreme court and denial of visa entry will impact the rights of the Citizens and non-citizens who had lengthy residency in the U.S. under the Tenth Amendments where act of omission occurred in state of Missouri and the right to challenge removal under the First Amendment of freedom of speech which as well violet petitioner rights to challenge the removal as he do possess constitutional rights under (Due Right Process) under the Fifth Amendment. petitioner will be exempt of Mandel review if proven by tangible evidence beyond reasonable doubt that petitioner removed under security grounds then he will be exempt of Mandel review of which has not been proven nor proven that petitioner proceed removal as Criminal Alien *See Kerry v. Din 576 U.S. ___ (2015).*

6. petitioner been removed as flight-risk without conclusion of the law nor fair trial of which both the FBI and ICE-KCMO can prove as there are no evidence suggesting that petitioner when released will be danger on community since there are no prior conviction nor criminal record suggesting that. The Supreme court agree on the fact if there are proven evidence suggesting

community danger then there are no release nor temporary relief can be found like released on bond pending trail *see United State v. Salerno, 481 US 739 (1987)*.

7. petitioner depraved his right of an attorney of which he want present which he signed representation form G-28 and forced to sign forms discovered to be self- incriminating which is prohibited under the Fifth amendment to be a witness of a crime against himself without conclusion of the law to proceed removal as criminal alien while was under the custody of ICE-KCMO *See Gideon v. Wainwright, 372 U.S. 335 (1963). See also Powell v. Alabama, 287 U.S. 45 (1932).* Supreme court decision on *Padilla v. Kentucky, 556 U.S. 356 (2010)* [The lawyer for an alien, charged with a crime, has a constitutional obligation to tell the client if a guilty plea carries a risk that he will be deported]. ([n}o person ... shall be compelled in any crime case to witness against himself) *see Malloy v. Hogan, 378 U.S. 1,6 (1964).* Petitioner argue that he depraved rights for a counsel and witness against himself in a crime never committed by signing forms indicting himself as criminal alien while petitioner was under state of fear and shock and without presents of his attorney which violating his rights under the Fifth and Sixth Amendments provided to the state via Fourteenth amendment.

8. petitioner who had attended the FBI-KCMO interview to fulfil the requirement of "Reasonable Suspicion" which targeting all citizen and noncitizen of Muslim or Arab background. Petitioner attended voluntarily to the FBI-KCMO office based upon his understanding that he has clear non-criminal record nor known to show sympathy to any organizations and had prior 14 years residency in the U.S. with proof of education. It is the right of the FBI and ICE- KCMO to question any person without violating the suspect rights under the Fourth amendment *see Terry v. Ohio, 392 U.S. 1 (1968).* (Police may stop a person if they have a reasonable suspicion that the person has committed or is about to commit a crime, and may frisk the suspect for weapons if they have reasonable suspicion that the suspect is armed and dangerous, without violating the Fourth Amendment prohibition on unreasonable searches and seizures. Supreme Court of Ohio affirmed). Petitioner rights under the Fourth amendment has been violated where he has been taken to ICE-KCMO custody without reading rights where petitioner has been kidnaped then transferred pass the interstate.

9. To defeat motion to dismiss (a plaintiff must plead enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face) *see Bell Atlantic Corp v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007).* Petitioner with all confident plead enough facts to present his case based upon information provided from Freedom of Information Act office, Shawnee County Jail- Topeka, KS booking report and the FBI- Universal Control No. 958484AC9. Evaluating all facts and factors and present to the Justice as petitioner removal was based by fraud and forgery to proceed removal as criminal alien without indictment of court of jurisdiction and made regardless of his clear non- criminal record., issue of UCN by the FBI which issued only to most dangerous individuals without legal conclusion of court of jurisdiction supervision, petitioner has been removed without recorded A-file No. 097319371 as the hard paper not registered with the system. The Shawnee county Booking report was not found of the file storage area which indicating that it was concealed petitioner been informed of this information by the Director of Shawnee County Jail. All the mentioned above are facts more then enough for the court to consider yet the Supreme Court seams to ignore such facts or even not bother to examine the evidence included with the argument.

10. the District Court of Western Missouri dismissed the case as failure to state a claim upon which relief maybe granted. Court of Appeal for Cir 8 including the Supreme court agreed upon this fact. It seems all court system not willing to examine the evidence for reasons not clear to us which violate previous supreme court opinion. *See Conley v. Gibson, 355 U.S. 41, 45-46 (1957)* ([A] complaint should not be dismissed for failure to state a claim unless it appears beyond doubt that

the plaintiff can prove no set of facts in support of his claim which would entitle him to relief). Nothing petitioner didn't demonstrate with support of evidence and analyzing facts that removal made upon targeting his race to proceed removal as criminal alien by falsifying federal government record by fraud and forgery. The Supreme Court didn't examine the case and analyzed facts and factors before issuing its denial and contradict with its previous opinion.

11. The pleading standard has been heightened to prevent excessive judicial harassment (The plausibility standard is not akin to a "probability requirement" but it asks for more than sheer possibility that defendant has acted unlawfully). *See Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (internal citation omitted)*. Petitioner provided the court with evidence beyond reasonable doubt that the defended acted unlawfully by falsifying all legal forms by fraud and forgery to remove petitioner as Criminal Alien regardless of his clear non-criminal record.

12. the heightened pleading standard has been approved by another supreme court case (while a compliant need not contain detailed factual allegations, it must set forth "more than label and conclusions, and formulaic recitation of elements of a cause of action will not do".) *see Twombly, 550 U.S. at 555 (citation omitted).* The plausibility standard presented by petitioner suggested there are by far more the wrongdoing which will affect the United States reputation based upon three facts (1) petitioner do possess constitutional rights of which has been violated and denial the case for Supreme Court review it means it will forfeit the right of the People of the U.S. and the minorities rights. (2) petitioner who is national Citizen of Italy and who is European national if the case will be publicized will affect the Reciprocal elements. (3) the denial will encourage Federal law officers acting under color of law to continue violating the rights of the people secured to them by the constitution without restrict standard of use of power which will weakened the power of the federal Government as more cases will be filed in court for such violations.

13. petitioner provide an evidence suggested that he is eligible for civil right claim under 42 U.S.C. 1983 where he was deprived his rights secured to him by the constitution and it has been caused by the officers of the agency the FBI and ICE-KCMO who are preforming their duties under color of law *See Flagg Bros. v. Brooks, 436 U.S. 149, 155-57(1978).*

14. petitioner emphasized that his Right under the Fourth Amendment which prohibited unreasonable search and seizure has been violated. Even though petitioner provided the court with extensive evidence suggested wrongdoing by the officers acting under color of law. petitioner been removed under 8 U.S.C. 1226 or section INA 236 without stating under which category of criminal petitioner has been found as "aggravated felony" under 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(43) which ICE-KCMO didn't state clearly nor the FBI-KCMO who issued universal control No. 958484AC9 which issued to most dangerous individual where dose the petitioner criminal act stated under. In Supreme Court Decision (affirmed the 2d Circuit, which deferred the BIA that a state conviction with one day of imprisonment constitute an aggravated felony under 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(43)(E)(i) i.e., 18 U.S.C. 844(i) a federal offense punishable by nor less than 5 years and not more than 20 years of imprisonment) see *Luna Torres v. Lynch, 578 U.S. (2016)*
If the Supreme court emphasized under criminal procedure the category of the crime has to be clearly mentioned then the service and the FBI must show under which category imprisonment if any of petitioner and what equivalent under 18 U.S.C. and 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(43) of which both fail to demonstrate due to petitioner clear non-criminal record.

15. the U.S government after the attack of tragedy of Sept 11 held many illegal aliens might be of high interest to national security by the FBI in area of NY. In April 17, 2002 the plaintiff sue the U.S government alleged that the Department of justice including the detention facilities MCD violate the Equal protection clause and the substantive due process clause and they had the right

to sue under an implied cause of action crated by *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agent, 403 U.S. 388(1971)*. The supreme Court decision on *Ziglar v. Abbasi, 582, U.S. (2017)* stating (A Bivens-type remedy should not be extended to the claims challenging the confinement conditions imposed on respondents pursuant to the formal policy adopted by the Executive Officials in the wake of the September 11 attacks). Petitioner case are major turn on Ziglar case for a reason he has been targeted based upon his race and national origin of which he has no links traced to any county that has been supported of terrorism or under suspicion by the authority as he is national citizen of Italy where he born with previous legal fourteen years under F-1 visa. The act of the FBI was deliberately made to include petitioner as criminal alien to proceed removal by illegally issued the FBI- UCN 958484AC9 without conclusion of the law which has been made by computer fraud and falsifying then concealed all elements related to removal of petitioner.

16. due to factors mentioned above petitioner eligibility for review under Bivens maybe considered as both (the Equal Protection Clause) and (Substantive due process Clause) been violated which give him the right to sue under (implied Cause of action) under Bivens. to be included under the framework of Bivens two factors must be shown 1) petitioner has been depraved his right under the constitution that provide him immunity as 1st,4th, 5th, 6th , 8th of his rights under the constitution violated which petitioner show this prove to be plausible on its face. 2) the officers of the FBI and ICE-KCMO preforming their duty under color of law acted unconstitutionally which permit petitioner to bring lawsuit under 42 U.S.C. 1985(3).

17. in supreme court decision *Davis v. Passman., 442 U.S., 288 (1979).* (court revised lower court conclusion by relaying on Bivens and Butz v. Economou (1978) both cases affirmed citizen right to sue federal officers for constitutional violation. In case, passman violate Davis rights through sexual discrimination). Petitioner argue that his rights which his possess based upon previous residency of 14 years prior of last entry under VWP has violate his due Right process under the fifth amendment where he has been discriminated then removed based upon his race and national origin.

18. in *Carlson v. Green, 446 U.S., 14 (1980)* the court held that damages remedy would be available despite the absent of any statute conferring such rights unless (1) Congress provided alternative remedy which explicitly declare to be substitute for recovery directly under the constitution (2) defendant could demonstrate any special factors counseling hesitation. Petitioner want to demonstrate to the court the "Special Factors" associated with his removal Petitioner proceed removal on mandatory detention as Criminal alien under 8 U.S.C. 1226 (c) without court of jurisdiction nor indictment of guilt produced confirming this fact due to his clear non-criminal record. removal made as criminal alien was "Falsely Make" of forms and document with attention to harm as stated under 8 U.S.C. 1324c(f) which shown obviously on all forms provided to court and found of petitioner record. among other violations which maybe classified under "Special Factors" ,False arrest and imprisonment under 42 U.S.C. 1983, valuating petitioner civil rights under 42 U.S.C. 1981, 18 U.S.C. 242, 18 U.S.C. 245(b)(2), and 18 U.S.C. 241.

19. since removal made by fraud and forgery in legal forms and attempted deliberately to concealed all evidence related to removal of petitioner it wasn't clear if there was remedy available, tell discovery made by petitioner which indicated there are and attention to harm petitioner to include him under Mandatory Detention as Criminal Alien. it has not been proven due to petitioner clear non- Criminal record nor proven there was overstaying time to classify petitioner as Illegal Alien or Undocumented alien as the days found overstayed didn't exceed 180 day. Petitioner Argue even if the overstayed time which proved to be less than 180 will be over the 364 he cannot be classified

as Illegal or Undocumented Alien by the power of the U.S. constitution and federal laws and regulations since he had 14 years previous residency which made him eligible for constitutional immunity. Thus, petitioner will be eligible under Bivens Remedy see supreme court decision *Bush v. Lucas, 462 U.S. 367 (1983)* (the court refrained from implying Bivens Remedy due to the availability of alternative remedies for the first time.) since removal made by obvious fraud and forgery to proceed removal under mandatory detention as Criminal Alien then there are NO remedy provided on the First Time which give eligibility to have petitioner case reviewed under Bivens. evidence provided to court suggested that the act of the officers in charge of petitioner removal made without full awareness of the FBI, ICE, Department of Justice and Homeland Security Department, Bivens Remedy crafted to prevent any harm or mistreatment to individuals who might have their constitutional immunity provide to then via U.S. constitution harmed by officers while preforming their duties under color of law. however, the federal agencies mentioned above take share of behavior of their employees and as well accessories of criminal act committed by their employee which exposed petitioner to danger of losing his life while under detention process by ICE-KCMO and the act of the employee maybe classified as Crime Against the Constitution which has been made deliberately with intention to harm. *See FDIC v. Mayer, 510 U.S. 471(1994) and Correctional Service Corporation v. Malesko, 534, U.S. 61 (2001)* [the court held that the fundamental logic supporting Bivens was to deter constitutional violations by individual officers, not federal agencies.]. since the violation found on record lead by discovery made by petitioner suggested criminal act then it is as valuation which extended to the integrity of the constitution of the United States as this act made knowingly and Voluntarily to harm petitioner. Petitioner emphasized the purpose of this lawsuit was to restored his rights that has been violated which has been both approved and recognized by the constitution of the U.S. without any attention to use this lawsuit in Retaliation attempt against the Government as the probable cause and elements of harm has been found and analyzed which will give eligibility for review under Bivens Remedy unless defendant prove opposite of the petitioner claim under Fed. R. Prod 40(a)(1), (2). *See Hartman v. Moore, 547, U.S. 250 (2006) [* Ruling that the plaintiffs in Bivens actions for retaliatory prosecution must plead and prove the luck of probable cause for underlying criminal charges]

20. in criminal offence concerning incarceration of an alien of period of at least a year, alien will be subject to mandatory detention as stated under 8 U.S.C. 1226 (c) upon his release either promptly upon release of alien of the criminal custody of sometimes after. Petitioner who have never commit any criminal act rendered removal nor committed any criminal act during his lengthy legal residency under non-immigrant F-1 visa. The FBI and ICE-KCMO they demonstrate failure to prove with evidence that petitioner committed act of crime which rendered to removal as there are no proof of convection found nor an indictment issued by court of jurisdiction. Supreme court case *Nielson v. Preap, 586 U.S. (2019)* [Ruling A noncitizen not become exempt from mandatory detention under 8 U.S.C. 1226(c) through the failure of the secretary of Homeland Security to take him into immigration custody immediately upon release from criminal custody]. Petitioner who have been removed proceeding as criminal alien under 8 U.S.C. 1226(c) under mandatory detention which ICE and the FBI-KCMO have lack of probable cause suggesting that petitioner incarcerated for period of 1 year or over during previously committed criminal act which can be distinguished as removable offence nor show prove that petitioner removed from the U.S. as convicted Criminal Alien as simply he has no criminal record suggesting this fact where all his record has been falsified by fraud and forgery. Thus, petitioner request the court immediate attention for a mandatory relief. Petitioner disagree with the court on its judgment stated above even though that petitioner cannot be included within mandatory detention giving his clear record, but he has been removed this way deliberately with attention to harm. Thus, petitioner state his opinion of the supreme court opinion which it contradicts with previous opinions. In *INS v. Lopesz- Mendoza 468, U.S. 1032 (1984)* ruling that immigration removal proceedings are civil matter, The Court reversed the decision of the lower court and held that the Fourth Amendment's exclusionary rule did not apply to the INS'

deportation hearings, and thus, respondents were properly determined to be aliens subject to deportation.

21. the FBI and ICE- KCMO collaborated to disseminate wrongful information of petitioner record violating the Privacy Act of 1974 stated under 5 U.S.C. 552a. distribution of record found it doesn't reflect petitioner true information as he removed as criminal alien which has been made by falsification and disseminating false information of record which found on Freedom of information record. the constitution didn't mention right to privacy *see Paul v. Davis, 424 U.S. 693, 712 (1976)* [noting right to privacy not found in any specific constitutional guarantee.] see also *Roe v. Wade, 410, U.S. 113, 152 (1973).[* finding no explicit mention of right to privacy in constitution]. Even though the right of privacy not mentioned in the constitution the court recognized the right of personal and zone of privacy *see Roe v. Wade, 410, U.S. 113, 152 (1973).* [finding only fundamental individual rights protected under right of personal privacy]. See *Griswold v. Connecticut. 381, U.S. 479, 484 (1965)*. [recognizing zone of privacy]. Petitioner rights of individual privacy has been violated by disseminating deliberately wrongful information to proceed removal as criminal alien under "Mandatory Detention" without conclusion of the law nor clear indictment of guilt from court of jurisdiction and made regardless of his clear non-criminal record, targeting his race and national origin as Iraqi descent during invasion of Iraq by the U.S. troops. The supreme court on its decision on Griswold recognize the constitutional rights under zone of privacy [in *Griswold*, the supreme court found that "[v]arious guarantees [in the Bill of Rights] create zone of privacy." *Griswold, 381 U.S. at 484*. Specifically, the court recognized zones of privacy formed by the first amendment right of association, the third amendment prohibition against quartering of soldiers in home during peace time without consent, the fourth amendment right of individuals to be secured at home from unreasonable search and seizure, and the fifth amendment protection against self- incrimination . Id]. Petitioner proved clear evidence plausible on its face that his rights under the "Privacy Zone" of which the supreme court have recognized under "Bill of Rights" and interpreted under the 1st, 4th and the 5th amendments which has been clearly violated and has been discovered by petitioner due- diligent. The congress set elements of privacy act of 1974, 5 U.S.C. 552a (1988) (Congregational Findings and Statement of Purpose). The Congress found that:

1. The privacy of individual directly affected be the collection, maintenance, use, and dissemination of personal information by federal agencies
2. The increasing use of computers and sophisticated technology, while essential to the efficient operations of the Government, has generally magnified the harm to individual privacy that can occur from any collection, maintenance, use, or dissemination of personal information
3. The opportunity of individual to secure employment, insurance and credit, and his right to due process, and other legal protections are endangered by the misuse of certain information systems;
4. The right to privacy is personal fundamental right protected by the Constitution of the United States and
5. In order to protect the privacy of individuals identified in information systems maintained by Federal agencies, it is necessary and proper for the congress to regulate the collection, maintenance, use, and dissemination of information by such agencies.

The Congress recognized many facts which will be applicable to petitioner case.1) individual maybe harmed by the use and dissemination of individual privacy of personal information that caused by this collection. 2) the privacy rights of individual information protected by the Constitution of the U.S. and 3) the possibilities of individual personal information to be misused of collection of information by the federal agencies. Evaluating the fundamental purpose of the lawsuit shows that petitioner rights under the constitution and his individual information has been

violated as he proceed removal as Criminal Alien under "Mandatory Detention" made by dissemination and misuse his individual information under the privacy rights which has been approved it was made by "Computer Fraud" committed by the employee of the federal agencies the FBI and ICE-KCMO as his record clear of any criminal act rendered to removal. additionally petitioner do possess due right process under the United States Constitution giving his lengthy residency under F-1 Visa where temporary absents of 19 months then seeking admission under VWP to the U.S. cannot take prior legal residency of fourteen years and due right process of petitioner may exist as it cannot be taken away of petitioner history specially there are proof of education, investment and clear non- criminal record. thus, petitioner rights exist which will made him qualified for fair review by the Supreme Court.

22. according to statue of limitation 28 U.S.C. 2462 which has been evaluated by Supreme Court Chief Justice John Roberts which allow civil lawsuit against U.S. Government within five years from the date the claim first accrued not from the date been discovered. There two exceptional facts applicable to petitioner case been drown by the court 1) victims who injured by fraud forgery leave victims unaware of the harm, and 2) tolling will be available remedy under 28 U.S.C. 2462 if alleged conducts were fraudulently concealed. *See Gabelli et al v. Security Exchange Commission, 568 U.S. (2013).* Petitioner has provided enough evidence based upon Freedom of Information Act that removal was based upon falsifying record by fraud, forgery and concealed records. Over estimated 65 to 70 federal violations and consists of 7 amendments of the U.S. constitution been violated by ICE and the FBI-KCMO employee to remove only one person as Iraqi national who is not and as criminal alien who is not and as VWP violator which has not proved to be since the overstayed time not enough to provide voluntary departure and three years band. Even though if the time overstayed exceed 1-year removal of petitioner cannot be done which will violate his constitutional rights under the fifth amendment based upon previous entry of 14 years living in the U.S. yet, the justices of the Supreme Court tragically not willing to discuss nor consider which will effect the process of justice in the United States If any.

23. charges found on concealed Shawnee County jail- Topeka, KS Booking report (Civil & Criminal Penalties Exist for Misuse & Unlawful Dissemination). The charges found on booking report it doesn't rely upon any facts of the law and was issued only to justify unlawfully the issue of the FBI-UCN 958484AC9. There are no state charges been made in regard on any confession at the time been taking to custody. Therefore, it cannot be applicable to 18 U.S.C. 3501(c). in *United States v. Alvarez-Sanchez 511 US, 350 (1994)* [The court explained that no delay is said to occur until the suspect is arrested and detained for a federal crime. The six-hour period only begin to expire from the point of suspect's federal arrest and charging the fact that he was held for two and a half days prior has no bearing on his federal status under the statue since he was detained on state and local charges only during that time]. there are no statement nor federal charges been brought against petitioner. where he was held under ICE-KCMO Custody for period of 19 days and no federal charges been brought. Additionally, no voluntary confession of charges mentioned above has been provided by petitioner at that time which mandate Marinda *see Dickerson v. United States, 350 US, 428 (2000)*. And during and after the FBI interview been done there wear no probable cause nor exigent circumstances recorded at the time of the interview to read Miranda Rights. *In Miranda v. Arizona, 384 US, 436 (1966)* the Supreme Court ruled that detained criminal suspects, prior to police questioning, must be informed of their constitutional right to an attorney and against self-incrimination. Evidence suggested that petitioner forced to sign documents incriminating himself which violate his due right process and without presents of his attorney which violate the fifth and the sixth amendment. thus, the charges found on Shawnee Booking repot was fabricated and Miranda rights has not been read due to lack of evidence. Happens only in America not even Middle East and third world countries would NOT do such a crime which has been approved by the Supreme Court Denial and violate its own previous opinion.

24. according to laws and regulations govern overstay on VWP they will be subject to prompt removal if found by authorities and exempt of review before an immigration judge as stated under 8 CFR 217.4(b)(1), (2) additionally, VWP overstay there time of 90 days will be exempt of expedited removal as stated under INA 235.3(b)(10). Band reentry will be initiated based upon overstayed time by days over 180 to 364 band of 3-years and voluntary departure or 10 years band of reentry if exceed 364- days. Petitioner who have lived in the United States legally for period of 14 years in good standing without prior criminal record he is entitled for due right process where temporary absent of 19 months then seek admission under VWP cannot take previous rights regardless of signing waiver of rights on form I-94W. therefore, petitioner not exempt of fair review under Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigration Responsibility Act 1996. Among many issues discuss on IIRIRA is the Stop-Time Rule where alien will be placed under removal proceeding. petitioner argue even if he was admitted under VWP the stop time rule will be applicable based upon previous legal admission of 14 years of which cannot be taken of petitioner history. Aliens will be exempt of Stop-Time Rule if committed any crime prior to April 1, 1997. Petitioner who proven he never committed any criminal act and removal made against him to include him as Criminal Alien it doesn't relay upon any facts since the removal made was done by fraud and forgery to include petitioner as criminal alien without intimate from court of jurisdiction. Thus, petitioner does not exempt from stop-time rule. Additionally, as IIRIRA stated he is eligible of cancelation of removal as sated under 8 U.S.C. 1229b(b)(1) based upon his clear record, good moral standard and lengthy time of residency over 10 years. Other issue disused on IIRIRA is established eligibility to challenge removal proceeding at any times outside of the United States which never been done prior of IIRIRA. The trick used against petitioner to include him under (Secure Community) program which targeting criminal alien and it is known according to the reform act that challenging removal outside of the U.S. it won't be available legal option since all evidence of removal has been fraudulently concealed to impose Indefinite removal not tell petitioner has discovered all elements including the fact that fingerprints has been falsified and of what appeared on page 27 of ICE-FOIA as petitioner request to have forensic biometric test it has been declined since there are no authority to do so. Petitioner as well suspected that attorney in charge of his legal representation and singed form G-28 involved way or the other in petitioner removal where he wasn't present at the time where petitioner under ICE-KCMO custody and signed forms unaware of which indicting himself as criminal alien. Therefore, petitioner and based upon facts presented he is not exempt of challenging his case of removal outside U.S. to challenge removal will be found under 8 U.S.C. 1326(d) the alien exhausted any administrative remedies that may have been available to seek relief against the order, the deportation proceeding at which the order was issues improperly deprived the alien of opportunity for judicial review and, the entry of the order was fundamentally unfair. Petitioner argued in his argument that he exhausted all remedies to have his case of removal finally reviewed by neutral decision maker in western district of Missouri to court of appeal for cir8 to the Supreme Court of the U.S. which has denied the case and will be soon for the rehearing without giving any opportunity to examine the evidence enclosed. Petitioner has been removed as criminal alien without court of jurisdiction to initiate guilty verdict as the removal made by fraud and forgery and removal was unfair since it violates petitioner constitutional rights under the First, Fourth, fifth, Eighth and Fourteenth amendments. on *Pereria v. Sessions, 585 US_ (2018)* [ruling A notice to appear that dose not include the specific time and place of the noncitizen's removal proceedings dose not trigger the stop-time rule under 1229(a) of the INA]. Petitioner agree that he has been removed as VWP which exempt him of issue notice to appear, however it has not been proven that petitioner was found in violation of his VWP since it doesn't reach to removable offence. Petitioner been removed as criminal alien under mandatory detention without tangible proof that he was committing any criminal act nor serve any sentence of 1 year or above due to his clear record which has been falsified by fraud and forgery by ICE and the FBI-KCMO. Thus, and according to evidence produced petitioner does not exempt to challenge his removal outside of the

U.S. nor exempt of Stop-Time Rule. Notice to Appear must include time, place and location of the court to trigger the stop-time rule which it applies to all immigration forms initiated to proceed removal of an alien. Petitioner who been removed as Criminal Alien the service didn't clearly show the apprehension date which specify "time" "Place" and "Location" as it has been falsified and changed from 04/11/2003 to 10/04/2003 to identify the criminal act by local state or federal officers. "Time", "Place" and "Location" of court of jurisdiction initiating indictment of guilt has not been found since removal made by fraud and forgery to proceed as criminal alien under mandatory detention and, from I-296 under Verification of removal it doesn't state clearly "time" "Place" and "Location" where petitioner has left the country because it contradicts with the same form found on File. Therefore according to 8 U.S.C. 1231(a)(1)(A) petitioner has not been detained and currently under 90 days removal proceeding as well has not determined the finality of removal if removal was confirmed as VWP or Criminal Alien who has done his confinement see 8 U.S.C. 1231(a)(B)(i) and (iii). Petitioner argue that Place, time and location cannot be understood under narrow matter only based upon Notice to Appear it is also applicable to all immigration forms. Therefore, providing the evidence that petitioner possesses clear non-criminal record and been removed as criminal alien under mandatory detention by falsifications of record as evidence suggested, thus, he is not exempt of included under Stop-Time Rule which suggested at this time it has not been triggered nor ended to place petitioner under removal proceedings as place time and location has not clearly mentioned nor finality suggested the cause of removal and based upon his lengthy time and clear record petitioner eligible of removal cancelation as stated under 8 U.S.C. 1229b(b)(1). as well the Service including the FBI-KCMO didn't show proof that petitioner removable by clear and convincing evidence as charged see 8 CFR 1240.8(a)

25. the reasons where the FBI and ICE-KCMO impose mandatory detention against petitioner as criminal alien and concealed all evidence related to removal which made regardless of his clear non- criminal record, is to impose life band of entry as the case cannot be approved due to luck of evidence even if it will be opened outside of the U.S. The United States under two separate cases Curtailed the government's ability to hold aliens in "removal proceedings" indefinitely. *See Zadvydas v. David 533 U.S. 678 (2001)* the same issue has been addressed on *Jennings v. Rodriguez 583 U.S. ____ (2018)*. Based upon facts provided and approved petitioner request the court of cancelation of removal and financial compensations of pain and sufferings.

26. based upon petitioner characters over fourteen years of living in the U.S. where he earns his education and show ability to contribute to community that he has long tides without violating any laws. Additionally, petitioner has established two forms of business to enhance his tides pay taxes and create jobs *see Arizona v. United State, 567 US, 387 (2012)* "[d]iscrestion in the enforcement of immigration law embrace immediate human concerns. Unauthorized workers trying to support their families, for example, likely pose less danger then alien smugglers or aliens who committed serious crimes. The equity of an individual case may turn on many factors, including whether the alien has children born in the United State, long ties to the community [...]" 132 S.Ct. 2492, 2499 (2012). The supreme court did recognize the importance of long tides and clear record of which petitioner has over the years he lived in the United States and so far, his record is clean after many years since removal.

Finally, complying with Rule 44, there are elements not discussed on the argument as following

1- Waive of the government rights. The U.S. Solicitor General office acting attorney of the Government waive the government rights or response to petitioner case unless requested by the Court. Denial of the case has been issued by the court without initiating any investigation of the reasons waiving the government rights.

2- Removal of petitioner as criminal alien under mandatory detention made regardless of petitioner clear non-criminal record nor indictment of guilt initiated by court of jurisdiction violate petitioner "Zone of Privacy". Removal of petitioner was found in violation of the Privacy Act 1974, 5 U.S.C 552a has been made unlawfully by the officers of the FBI and ICE-KCMO acting under color of law. the officers attentionally with intend to harm petitioner by disseminating wrongful information on IDENT, NAILS, CIS, DACA, NCIC and CLASS system as criminal alien without conclusion of the law violating both Privacy Act and Supreme Court opinions see *Griswold v. Connecticut. 381, U.S. 479, 484 (1965)*. *Roe v. Wade, 410, U.S. 113, 152 (1973 and Paul v. Davis, 424 U.S. 693, 712 (1976).* The supreme court on its denial to the case not only contradicts with its previous opinions but as well directly or indirectly approve the crimes of officers against the constitution and violate its own procedures.

3- the court denials to review the case violate *"Article 16" office of the United Nations High commissioner of Human Rights. Retrieved July 2018* "[The United States] shall undertake to prevent in any territory under its jurisdiction other act of ***Cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment*** which do not amount to torture as defined on article I, when such acts are committed by or at the instigation of or with the consent or acquiescence of a public official or other person acting in an official capacity" (emphases added). The denial of the court indicate that the court do approve lesser torture and drained of substantial rights of the petitioner secured to him under the U.S. Constitution where petitioner forced to sign documents indicting himself as criminal without present of his attorney. Handcuffed without reading his rights and taken to his last known address in the U.S. where two officers of ICE entered his property without search warrant. Additionally, petitioner posed naked front of a guard degraded and dehumanized for only crime committed which is his race and national origin. the court by issuing its denial approving the act of the officers who committed this crime. Under *Chapter 11- Foreign policy: Senate OKs Ratification of Torture Treaty" (46th ed). CQ press 1990. Pp.806-7. Retrieved August 8, 2018* " The Three other reservations, also crafted with the help and approval of Bush Administration did the following: Limits the definition of Cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment to ***Cruel and unusual punishment*** as defined under the Fifth, Eight, and 14th Amendments to the constitution..."(emphasis added). Petitioner has been removed during Bush Administration during operation of liberating Iraq as fraudulently made record suggesting there was elements of retaliation made by officers of law to include petitioner as Iraqi national which he is not and violate Seven amendments of the U.S. Constitution plus over 65 federal violation which made the only case in the history of immigration with such violations in process similar to "Spanish Inquisition" targeting his race, national origin and religious believe.

4- Petitioner additionally argue that his rights under "Equal Protection Clause" has been violated. *See City of Cleburne v. Cleburne Living Center, Inc., 473 U.S. 432, 439 (1985)* "The Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment commands that ...all persons similarly situated should be treated alike". Petitioner has been removed as criminal alien without indictment where he will be subject to incarceration under "Punishment must fit the Crime" due to his clear record nor proven by tangible evidence that he found in violation of his immigration status, rather removal made targeting his race, national origin and religion believe by falsifying record to proceed removal as Criminal Alien which violate his rights under "Equal Protection Clause" of the 14th amendment.

Conclusion

Republic of Italy contribute to the United States on its War of fighting terrorism and distributing what is known as "Noble Causes" of distributing the American Principles of liberty, equality and justice. It was a lie of destroying weapons of mass distraction which has not found and cost us our national blood who happens to be our relatives, friends, neighbors and families and estimated loss to America and its of allies 2 trillion Dollars. If United States went by lies to fight terrorism, then the same lies permitted and used by the employee of the FBI and ICE-KCMO to remove petitioner of the U.S. as criminal Alien, VWP violator, and as an Iraqi national who NOT. The U.S. Government implemented the same elements used by former Iraqi regime where "Mandatory Detention" implemented against Iraqi national of Persian dissent and after almost 200 or 300 years living in Iraq before the border made and recognized under the United Nations wear both countries under the Ottoman Empire as many Persian lived in Iraq and find themselves Iraqis Arabs and many Arabs living in the Iranian shore find themselves Iranian nationals. The same criteria have been made against petitioner after living for 14 years in the U.S. Petitioner wander and ask the question What Noble cause America want to Iraqi to restore?

The Supreme court contradicts in decisions previously made regarding removal of criminal aliens of which petitioner has removed as criminal alien regardless of his clear record and found to be made by fraud and forgery. In *Nielson v. Preap, 586 US_(2019)* concluded that criminal alien who serve his time will be subject to removal either when alien released from incarceration or years after released. The opinion of the above case contradicts of what the court concluded on *Sessions v. Dimaya, 584 US (2018)* [Section 16(b) of the Immigration Nationality Act, which define "Crime of Violence" for purpose of eligibility for removal, is unconstitutionally vague under the Due process Clause of the Fifth Amendment.] Dimaya who have been incarcerated for two years of both conviction in California Under INA, a noncitizen convicted of aggravated felony includes "Crime of Violence" which is any offence that involves the use or substantial risk of physical force against another person or property. the Supreme court contradict dramatically of its decision almost a year after in Nielson v. Pearp that removal can be and will be made regardless of noncitizen serve time on imprisonment he will be subject to removal, if all crimes listed under 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(43) involved in way or the other definition of "Crime of Violence" to be classified as unconstitutionally vague under the Fifth Amendment using *Johnson v. United States, 576 U.S. (2015)* as standard for review. then in this case all noncitizens who released of imprisonment after serving their time of punishment of crime it will in violation of their Fifth Amendment.

The other issue petitioner willing to discuss on Preap is the cloud of uncertainty drawn around the court opinion as it will violate the "Double Jeopardy Clause" of the fifth amendment provides: [N]or shall any person be subject to for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb... Removal of Criminal Aliens who have served their time for crimes they have committed is put them on double jeopardy which violate their Due Right Process Clause under the Fifth amendment, where noncitizen who serve his time for a crime and will to be removed for the same crime he has already served see *United States v. Felix, 503 U.S., 378 (1992)* [a[n]... offence and a conspiracy to commit that offence are not the same offence for double jeopardy purpose.] see also *Ashe v. Swenson, 397 U.S., 436 (1970)* [...when an issue of ultimate fact has once been determined by valid and final judgment, then the issue cannot again be litigated between the same parties in any future lawsuit.]. Therefore, opinion made on Pearp case found to be in connection with almost 12 months between two cases that the supreme court made without giving any logical explanation.

Additionally, the court opinion on pearp maybe classified as "Cruel and Unusual Punishment" in *Furman v. Georgia. 408 U.S., 238 (1972)* Justice William Brennen wrote [There are, then four

principles by which we may determine whether a particular punishment is cruel and unusual. 1) The "essential predicate" is "that a punishment must not by its severity be degrading to human dignity", especially torture. 2)"A severe punishment that is obviously inflicted in wholly arbitrary fashion. 3)"A severe punishment that is clearly and totally rejected throughout society." 4)"A severe punishment that is patently unnecessary." Based upon Justice Brennen opinion Furman v. Georgia has been temporarily suspended. the decision of Pearp can be classified as to sever to the crime especially where criminal alien serve his time for the crime committed, and it was arbitrary as it offend society sense of justice most of noncitizens they have tides to society where others have family tides which will reflect badly upon how trust build up between law enforcement and people as no future trust can be made and finally, it degrading to human dignity to place a noncitizen under the same crime for punishment.

The reason petitioner deeply analyzed the case is petitioner has been removed as criminal alien under mandatory detention with only difference that he didn't committed any crime or had any past criminal history all the years lived in the U.S. the question present to the Justices of the Court who is responsible of this tragedy that petitioner been through? Is it the officers who acting under color of law, the federal agencies or the justice system of America? Or maybe combination of all. The truth is what happened to petitioner can be traced as lack of education and knowledge. I think and believe without Doubt now that the Top 25 universities which set the framework of education system of the U.S. are responsible of what happens to me and to America during war against terrorism. because they produce weak leadership by promoting Illiteracy as education. Some universities like Yale preaching satanic verses in secretive society as know or called skull and bones. these top universities must be discredited with no exception made of the crimes committed against knowledge, humanity and America. I understand and know that most of justices of the court are graduate of these university however, the United Sates Constitution which mentioned the U.S. Supreme Court didn't mentioned who will be elected to bench age, place of birth nor education as prerequisite to be the future justice which I think the constitution was and always be right too bad that wonderful constitution abused by people who take an oath to protected.

I know I made decision about continuing my education in the United States of which I have successfully achieved. But I was unexperienced kid age of 19 who think that he knows everything. As once fellow American friend said we made important decisions and choices of our life when we are very young and unexperienced that will affect us decades to come or maybe take it to our graves. I want to give my sincere apology to the Court and to America that I have once made wrongful choice to come to the U.S. for purpose of education and spend 14 years of my life in country view me different and based upon my race, national origin and religious believes. It is embarrassing that America lost all its principles that the father founder of the U.S. constitution contributes to make America grate by simply fighting terrorism.

Petitioner removed of the U.S. without minimal rights provided to him by the constitution, regardless of his fourteen years of legal residency, when officers of law take him to his place handcuffed after the Interview with the FBI-KCMO without warrant of arrest asking to collect few changes in small bag and take few documents exhibited on USCIS-FOIA which was phone numbers and business cards of clients petitioner doing business with, Petitioner has left U.S. without minimal animal rights. The officers of law committed criminal act against an innocent civilian and without conclusion of the law.

It seems the United States Going back to era of the "Wild West" where no laws nor rights provided, and by denial the case for review by the Supreme Court and the lower courts suggesting that this era become standard practice substituting freedom, equality, and justice that mentioned in the

constitution. This act will encourage officers of law to keep violating the law and rights of people. The denial of this case it shows by evidence that the Supreme Court and the legal justice of America willing to cover up of the crimes of the officers of law and the government failure to fight crimes and terrorism.

Petitioner want to remined the court possibility of discussing the case within Italian supreme court to restore his rights is an available option. other option is to publicize this matter in channels of media to raise awareness of fellow Italians and European national who think about visiting the United states which will raise the issue of reciprocal *See Arizona v. United States, 567 U.S. 387, 395 (2012) [* Perceived mistreatment of aliens in the United States may lead to harmful reciprocal treatment of American citizens abroad].

As example of mistreatment when petitioner apply second time with the U.S. Consular Section-Kyiv, under request of the Italian Embassy to find out the reasons of approval then denial of visa application to the U.S. where petitioners been mistreated then where the officer insulting his country by claiming that petitioner seeking legal admission to perfume illegal employment. Want to mention to the court that Italy by far more then this despicable individual who is the employee of the government to insult my country. Italy which named America and discovered by another Italian by far more then this individual who acted unlawfully outside his scope of employment before hand over Denial under 214(b). Italy has an impact on the world twice in its history during the Roman era where the first Court ever introduced in year 1300 B.C. where the notion of "all accused are innocent tell proven Guilty in court of law" has been initiated. I am thinking what was America back then, Buffalos and American- Indians running around? Where Italy was and so far, is civilized country which by far cannot be compared to U.S. by today standard, Italy as well impacted the world on the Era of the Renaissance that is continue to the present day. Thus, I will seek another lawsuit against the Department of State of insulting my country and I will officially inform the Italian Embassy- Kyiv of this insult.

Finally, I am bind of what I wrote giving the rights provided to me under the First amendment of the U.S. constitution of "Freedom of Speech" and what is equivalent to it in the United Kingdom, Republic of Italy and the European Union.

Any act of retaliation or revenge by disseminating my physical address and location including phone numbers or by any means to crate or allow directly or indirectly to crate false information of arrest by Federal Bureau of Investigation and Immigration Customs Enforcement as I know these federal agencies has an international arms where it can reach me where I currently live, as there act that might be harmful to my safety wellbeing while I am living in the U.K. and any other country while publicizing my case for purpose of raising awareness. The U.S. Supreme Court including the lower courts where the case filed will take legal responsibility of my personal safety.

Thank you for the two minutes review to my case, will be waiting your unpublished denial of the rehearing.

The Petition of Rehearing is presented in good faith and not for delay

Respectfully Submitted

/s/ Omer Al Obaidy July 1, 2019

Additional material from this filing is available in the Clerk's Office.