

III 18-8905

No. \_\_\_\_\_

ORIGINAL

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Supreme Court, U.S.  
FILED

MAR 25 2019

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

Anthony G.  
Bryant

(Your Name)

— PETITIONER

U.S. Army vs.

of Corp Engineers

RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

U.S. Court of Appeals  
For the Fourth Circuit

(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Anthony G. Bryant

(Your Name)

2123 Courland Avenue

(Address)

Charleston S.C. 29703

(City, State, Zip Code)


N/A

(Phone Number)

#### IV

##### Questions Presented

Petitioner cites Errors by US Court of Appeals for the Fourth District clear of Eighth Amendment regarding excessive fines Tyson Timbs v State of Indiana is clear regarding Occurrence and Bad Faith by local and state government and abuse of the Tenth Amendment. Fourteenth Amendment provides for Equal Protection and Due Process without any money after asset seizure how can any person file necessary fees to proceed within any local , state, and federal court. Petitioner made public comment under Administrative Procedure Act of 1946 Notice, Procedure, Effective Date Asset Seizure undermined Petitioners ability to Redress under the First Amendment and denied Right to Vote and qualified assembly under DEA, FBI, Homeland Security and other federal components with no " Social Media" component within the Justice Department under Fourth Amendment person , house, papers and effects denying by default Sixth Amendment protections and criminal discovery abuse operating in bad faith even qualifying religion and rights to vote US v Cruikshank and US v Reese .




## 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 U.S. Army Corp of  
Engineers  
69A HAYWOOD Avenue  
CHARLESTON S.C. 29403
2. South CAROLINA ~~Health~~  
Department of Health  
and Environmental  
Control  
1362 McMillan Avenue  
CHARLESTON S.C. 29405



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:

A Horny General of The  
United States  
950 Pennsylvania  
Avenue  
Washington D.C. 20530  
Administrative  
Charleston County S.C.  
4500 ~~Lowater Ham~~  
Bridgeview Drive  
Charleston S.C. 29405

~~VII~~

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW .....	1
JURISDICTION.....	
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED .....	
STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....	
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT .....	
CONCLUSION.....	

~~VII~~

## INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	U.S. Court of Appeal Unpublished
APPENDIX B	
APPENDIX C	
APPENDIX D	
APPENDIX E	
APPENDIX F	

# VIII

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

### CASES

### PAGE NUMBER

TARASOFF v Regents of the  
University of California  
JONES v United States

SAFE Harbor Shremps v  
DATA Protection Commission  
Tyson Timbs v State of Indiana

### STATUTES AND RULES

Stored Communications Act  
Freedom of Information Act 1996  
Administrative Procedure Act 1946  
Sunshine Act 1976  
1934 Communications Act

### OTHER

The Identity and  
Assumption of Interference  
Act of 1998

~~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 \_\_\_\_\_ 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 \_\_\_\_\_ 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**: *N/A*

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 \_\_\_\_\_ Feb 14<sup>th</sup> 25, 2019

☐ 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: \_\_\_\_\_, 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. § 1254(1).

☐ For cases from **state courts**:

N/A

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 Provision

Petitioner cites Rule Four of the United States District Court Senior Judge providing for Sovereign Immunity denying a person under the First Amendment regarding the redress of grievances. Petitioner filed under the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946 regarding U.S Army Corp of Engineers and permits issued that provided for a right to petition under the First Amendment the combined permit for example Boeing Corporation was undermined by South Carolina Health and Environmental Control that provide Notice within a Joint Procedure with US Army Corp of Engineers within Charleston County which had controlling identifiers Birth Identifier and served a 1989 South Carolina State Trooper warrant within the same year 2013 as the Boeing Corporation application violating under Title VI which provides for protection by the Justice Department for any citizen filing a Civil Rights Complaint. Petitioner filed EPA, HUD, Justice Department complaints in 2008- 2012 not knowing asset was seized under the Tenth Amendment December 15, 1791 Tenth Amendment was ratified it expressed the principle of federalism and state rights which support the entire plan of the constitution for the United States all remaining rights reserved for the states drafters of this amendment had two purpose in mind first as a necessary rule of construction and second as a reaffirmation of the nature of federalism . State of South Carolina was not in compliance of the Homeland Security directive in 2002 and allowed to be in non- compliance of real ID law meaning many citizen would be allowed to enter any federal building and based upon Internal Revenue Code 6109 any person given a financial institution the wrong the name and number meaning Social Security number, South Carolina Driver SCDMV License, Employment Identifier, US Department of Treasury (IRS) can be referred to local, county, state, and federal law enforcement Justice Department under the US Patriot Act August 6, 2010 after receiving letter dated June 23, 2010 expressed FBI, Homeland Security with a 30 year warrant in clear ERROR a physical reprisal supported by the Eighth Amendment US Marshall's based on a bogus warrant as a Political and Economical Reprisal confiscating my person and business under South Carolina Department of Social Services now with the US District Court of South Carolina with ability to seize a person Passport via US Postal Service and US Department of State supported by Internal Revenue Service.

## XII

### Statement of Case

Petitioner cites *Tyson Timbs v State of Indiana* regarding Asset Seizure as a Public Interest. Petitioner filed under the Inspector General Act 1977 regarding external complaints to HUD and the EPA regarding waste, fraud and abuse allowed under the First Amendment regarding the redress of grievances. Petitioner complied with the Justice Department Coordination and Review as instructed with contacting the US Attorney of State of South Carolina and Federal Bureau of Investigation protected under the Fourth Amendment a person shall be secure in one's person, house, papers, and personal effects. South Carolina Family Court placed my person on the FCC as a " Domestic Abuser" on the worldwide web based upon a false police report management by Charleston County Clerk of Court which has not been audited by the Ninth Circuit Solicitor which Town of Kiawah, St Paul's Fire Department within the Ninth Circuit Berkeley County School District Administrator was referred by Wells' Fargo to the FBI and has been prosecuted by the U.S. Attorney of South Carolina for a Ponzi Scheme and now Orangeburg County South Carolina has law enforcement being indicted while United States South Carolina Senior Judge claims all have Sovereign Immunity regarding waste fraud and abuse of federal programs and activities and let's not forget Richland County South Carolina Solicitor being indicted for waste fraud and abuse under Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 where within South Carolina many have been prosecuted for abusing the asset seizure laws Judicial Discretion has been abuse and clear violation of all constitutional protections leading to lost of all personal and business assets for filing a simple online Inspector General Complaint this is within the Public Interest how can a person have civil rights when he does not have resources to represent his life, liberty , property and/or pursuit of happiness.

## XIII

### Reason For Granting the Petition

Petitioner believes US Supreme Court should grant this Petition for it is in the best interest of the Public. Petitioner has been placed with an annual income below 30 percent of median family income for the area as determined by Housing and Urban Development basically AT Risk Homeless. Asset Seizure changes the dynamics for many in this country subjected to having Identifier confiscated under The Identity and Assumption Deterrence Act of 1996 denies a person under the Tenth Amendment where voting is controlled by the State of South Carolina in non-compliance with Real ID Laws and directive of Homeland Security in 2002 but will deny a person the right to vote for not having a South Carolina Driver License and/or South Carolina Identification. Article Four Relations Amongst the States provides for General Jurisdiction when a State may be in ERROR regarding conflicts of interest or variances regarding Records , Acts and Judicial Proceedings with the advent of the Internet and Social Media companies is the Fourth Amendment not being protected by federal agencies exposing the Public to Eighth Amendment Abuses by default and undermining a person a fair trial under the Sixth Amendment leading to Fourteenth Amendment being reserved for the powerful such as Boeing and Dominion Corporation that received millions in tax incentives and a bailout of Billions by the South Carolina Public

### XIII

#### Reason for Granting Petition

Service Commission were Petitioner made public comment regarding rate increased on November 2012 regarding SCE&G and VC Sumer \$ 9.6 Billion dollar debacle leading poor of South Carolina to be stuck with the Bill's while South Carolina Department of Commerce public comment regarding Palmetto Railways remove and replace the poor for South Carolina Port Authority along with the Georgia Ports Authority creating wealth for special interest while 40% percent of South Carolina is poor this Asset Seizure is within the Public Interest for all are reduce to these Class Action lawsuit for the US Supreme Court can only hear 1% percent of the cases while 99% percent are denied while many in this country cannot afford appearance and cannot afford \$300 dollars as I for filing fees and/or even under Rule 14 required 10 copies per justice " Sovereign Immunity" meaning the powerless are subjected by default to the denial of the basic rights provided by the framers in my case a direct descendant of the 13<sup>th</sup> amendment , 14<sup>th</sup> amendment, and 15<sup>th</sup> amendment .

### IV

#### Conclusion


Petitioner has been abridged all constitutional rights for exercising First Amendment Redress of Grievances which the Fourteenth Amendment was for the Equal Protection and Due Process of formerly enslaved African ' now Corporation such as Boeing and Dominion now uses the Corporation status provided by the United States Department of Treasury to avoid liabilities similar to East Indian Company founded in 1600 that laid out land grants that created the then colonies now the United States of America with the country limited to the voices of the Corporation and the rest of the Citizenry is subjects with rights and privileges in name only is the reason a person deemed AT Risk Homeless as a result of Asset Seizure supported by EPA, FBI. Homeland Security, and US Army Corp of Engineers that have Sovereign Immunity for not ignoring the levees within the Ninth Ward of New Orleans during Hurricane Katrina and/or the EPA and the State of Michigan regarding the Flint, Michigan Water Crisis. Petitioner filed based upon " Gentrification " after the 2008 Bailout that left many in this county At Risk Homeless, Homeless, and Chronically Homeless while Corporation did not even feel the pain as those that lost it all after \$700 Billion dollars still held in the United States Treasury. Petitioner had his membership of his Church question under the First Amendment of Freedom of Religion for I do not support to Death Penalty and the persecution of any person for my ancestor was persecuted from 1500 until the passage of the 1866 Civil Rights Act. Petitioner deems the US Supreme Court complicit regarding US v Cruishank were African Americans was persecuted for their right to vote and the first and second amendment was the bases that the Fourteenth Amendment did not apply in that case protecting the individual's in support of the Tenth Amendment reserving the right to the people in that case . Petitioner understand this case has a 1% chance of being heard so respectfully after being humiliated by the US Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and US District Court of South Carolina for my for centuries this court has ignored the cries of the poor and disenfranchised go fine a NEW NIGGER!!!! Sorry for all misspelled words, grammatical errors and improper page alignments.

Petitioner has provided all  
documents in order to  
have a person subjected  
to criminal discovery by  
DEA Markston, Dorchester  
and Berneby Court Sheriff's  
Office

**CONCLUSION**

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a series of loops and a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Date: \_\_\_\_\_