

In the Supreme Court of the United States

Bryant, Anthony G.


v

Case No 18-8905

United States Army Corp of Engineers

"Petition for Rehearing "Case Number 18-8905

Petitioner herewith complies with Rule 44.6 expressed by Supreme Court of the United States. Petitioner certify that the petition for rehearing is presented in good faith and not for delay. Petitioner resubmit based upon a Press Conference July 9, 2019 violation by Charleston County Sheriff's Office, Federal Bureau of Investigation, and South Carolina Law Enforcement Division (SLED), City of Charleston Police Department where United States Army Corp of Engineers is located within its municipal jurisdiction and United States Attorney for the State of South Carolina , Berkley County Sheriff's Office, Town of Mount Pleasant South Carolina with access under United States Postal Service Privacy Exemptions under Rule 29 Filing and Service of Documents: Special Notification: Rule 29 4(a)(b)(c) violated under Rule 17 Procedure of in an Original Action in ERROR Rule 17 3 Rule 29 service shall be made on both the Governor and the Attorney General of that State with Federal Trade Commission and Internal Revenue Service with federal jurisdiction of " Identity Theft a person can be wrongfully accused of crimes they did not commit. Petitioner request rehearing based upon a substantial or controlling effect or to other substantial grounds not presented in the case. Petition cites cases Flowers v State of Mississippi no 17-9572 and Gamble v United States. United States Court of Appeals Rule 21(a) for modification and correction based upon error Petitioner filed under Civil Rules not Criminal Rules under Habeas Corpus and/or Successive Habeas Corpus Petition under United States District Court of South Carolina Rule 83 VIII 04 an Error under Rule 64.01 seizure of person or property within the State of South Carolina or United States under Gamble v United States in Error and Tyson v Timbs v State of Indiana. Petitioner did not receive under Rule 83 III a Fair Trial Directive and Objected to the Report and Recommendation by United States District Court of South Carolina based upon Rule RD 1 Attorney Convicted of a Crime under Rule 83 Viii 02 Biven v Six Unknown Federal Bureau of Narcotics for many within Jurisdiction of South Carolina receiving federal financial assistance under the Justice Department and Homeland Security was accused of waste fraud and abuse and not in compliance of Homeland Security Directive in 2002 and Real ID laws based upon error Tyson Timbs v State of Indiana, Gamble v United States, and Flowers v State of Mississippi.



Anthony G Bryant

2123 Courtland Avenue

Charleston South Carolina 29403

