

No. _____

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

CHARLOTTE HORST,

Petitioner,

V.

SCOTT HORST,

Respondent,

MATTHEW HAGEN,

Respondent.

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,

Interested Party

APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE PETITION, EXCEED WORD AND PAGE LIMITS,

AND GRANT OF STAY FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

to the North Dakota Supreme Court

(Draft and Proposed Petition for Writ of Certiorari)

To the Honorable Chief Justice John Roberts of the United States Supreme Court

Charlotte Horst

4516 Lafayette Bismarck, ND 58503

Phone: (701) 220-1190 Charlotte.horst.2018@gmail.com

May 20, 2019

To the Honorable Chief Justice John Roberts of the United States Supreme Court

Applicant-Defendant, Charlotte Horst, Pro Se, respectfully request an extension of time to file a petition for writ of certiorari. Sup. Ct. R. 13.5.

The earliest deadline for Applicants to file the petition for case Hagen v. Horst 20180344 is Thursday, June 13, 2019, which is ninety days from Friday, March 15, 2019, the date when the North Dakota Supreme Court denied Petition for Rehearing.

The earliest deadline for Applicants to file the petition in case Horst v. Horst 20180402 is Wednesday, August 14, 2019 which is ninety days from Thursday, May 16, 2019, the date when the North Dakota Supreme Court denied Petition for Rehearing.

For good cause set forth herein, Applicant asks that the first deadline in Hagen v. Horst 20180344 of Thursday, June 13, 2019 be extended by sixty days pursuant to Sup. Ct. R. 12.4 to review two judgments involving identical and closely related questions so that the new deadline would be Monday, August 12, 2019.

Background and Preliminary Statement

ORGANIZED SYSTEMATIC WAR CRIMES-CHILD SLAVE TRADE

Organized Systematic War Crimes *18 U.S.C. §2441(d)(1)(A)(B)(D)(F)(G)(H)(I)*, human trafficking *18 U.S.C. §1591*, attempted murder *18 U.S.C. §1113*, and torture *18 U.S.C. §2340A* by 26 U.S. States and the United States District of Columbia and aided and abetted by 24 U.S. States; state sponsored terrorism, treason *18 U.S.C. §2381*, insurrection and rebellion *18 U.S.C. §2383* and XIV Amendment Section 3, violations of the Palermo Protocols of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, and criminal violations of XIII Amendment Section 1 under *N.D.C.C. §14-03-02* with *N.D.C.C. §27-20-44.1.d*, “before the courts” under solemnization of marriage, and without emancipation; violations of XIV Amendment Section 4 Claim on Loss of Emancipation, under *N.D.C.C. §14-05* and *N.D.C.C. §14-14.1* as actions of

insurrection and rebellion violating all privileges, immunities¹, liberties, rights, protections, and any other Constitutional freedoms of We the People; and violations of *18 U.S.C. §1201* and *18 U.S.C. §238*, *XIV Amendment Section 3*, under *N.D.C.C. §27-20-32.1* and *18 U.S.C. §1202* under *N.D.R.C. 8.2* in which the Supreme Court of the State of North Dakota, S.C.N.D., intentionally obstructed the record by omitting accusations of criminal violations and subject-matter emancipation from judicial review and barely asserting claims of violations of civil statutes such as XIV Amendment Section 4 and XIII Amendment were not adequately supported, are frivolous inherently, affirming requirement of heavier “artillery” than the First and Second Confiscation Acts, Proclamation of Emancipation, and the “artillery” used in the American Civil War for any actions federally questioning emancipation to a person, and stated that Ex Parte without jurisdiction does not suspend due process as due process can be established at a later date when due process has been obstructed from review because the S.C.N.D. has grossly and intentionally abused its authority organizing a system to obstruct any review from the record of federal question apparent throughout all stages of the appeal process, the bare assertion of providing due process at a later date applies to the fullest extent of Suspension of the Writ of Habeas Corpus², and when there are hundreds of thousands of minor children in forced child marriage under threat of emancipation to the protections of a person³ of the US Constitution, minor children are inherently under the emancipation protections of a parent or guardian, the S.C.N.D. willfully establishes the precedent and authority of case law to own children and their children as slaves under property of an estate until reaching the age of consent and award of any claims on the loss of emancipation of the minor slaves and their children, and the

¹ Article IV Section 2 Clause 1

² 28 U.S.C. Chapter 153, An Act relating to Habeas Corpus, Article I Section 9 Clause 2

³ XIV Amendment Section 1

Petitioner has filed for federal question against the Department of Justice, D.O.J., and President Donald J. Trump⁴ who implied that law for the emancipation to a person of the U.S. Constitution is a disability and states emancipation is not a right under the jurisdiction of any federal agency because the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice affirms that it is not a disability to be an unemancipated slave under contract as property of an estate until reaching the age of consent when the First and Second Confiscation Acts removed the original jurisdiction over the Emancipation Proceeding from state original jurisdiction reaffirmed by the Proclamation of Emancipation, adopted by the XIV Amendment, and safeguarded by the XIII and XV Amendments with the XXVI Amendment establishing precedent of the age of majority and first enumerated protection of emancipation protecting every class of persons and individual above and below the age of majority to the right of emancipation through representation.

Opinions Below-Appendix

1. North Dakota Supreme Court Opinion Hagen v. Horst pgs. 1-3
2. North Dakota Supreme Court Opinion Horst v. Horst pgs. 4-5
3. North Dakota Supreme Court Petition for Rehearing Horst v. Horst pgs. 6-7
4. North Dakota District Court Order Horst v. Horst pgs. 8-13
5. North Dakota District Court Findings of Fact Conclusion of Law and Order for Amended Judgment Horst v. Horst pgs. 14-26
6. North Dakota District Court Third Amended Judgment and Parenting Plan Horst v. Horst pgs. 27-32
7. North Dakota District Court Findings of Fact Conclusions of Law and Order for Judgment Hagen v. Horst pgs. 33-60

⁴ U.S. District Court District of North Dakota (Western) Case No. 1:19-CV-081

8. North Dakota District Court Judgment Hagen v. Horst pgs. 61-68
9. Petitioner's Memorandum in Support of Motion for Annulment Horst v. Horst pgs. 69-77
10. North Dakota Supreme Court Petition for Rehearing Hagen v. Horst pgs. 78-79

Jurisdiction

1. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a), Filed timely under 28 U.S.C. §2101(c), and request for stay under 28 U.S.C. §2101(f).
2. 30-07-C-00374; Horst v. Horst 20180402-Appeal from Opinion and Judgment from Morton County District Court Findings, Order, Judgment, first and second Amended Judgments, and Motion to Annulment ordered on October 31, 2018 and entered on November 21, 2018, by Gail Hagerty, District Court Judge, South Central Judicial District, under removal of the 1st Amendment freedom of speech and peaceful assembly and petition for redress of grievances, decided on April 11, 2019. Pursuant to N.D.R.App.P. 40 and the 1st Amendment right to peacefully assemble and Petition the Government for a redress of grievances and N.D.R.App.P. 2 relief from page limit, the Appellant Petitioned for Rehearing. Petition for Rehearing thereafter was denied on May 16, 2019.
3. 08-2017-DM-00999; Hagen v. Horst 20180344-Appeal from Opinion and Judgment from Burleigh County District Court Findings, Order, and Judgment ordered on August 16, 2018 and entered on August 16, 2018, by Bruce Romanick, District Court Judge, South Central Judicial District, under removal of the 1st Amendment freedom of speech and peaceful assembly and petition for redress of grievances, decided on February 21, 2019. Pursuant to N.D.R.App.P. 40 and the 1st Amendment (with previous briefed

interpretation of Petition for Redress and peaceful assembly being together implied unknowing this law has not been interpreted correctly and federal question has not resolved and corrected its meaning) and N.D.R.App.P. 2 relief from page limit, Appellant Petitioned for Rehearing. Petition for Rehearing thereafter was denied on March 15, 2019.

4. Pursuant to F.R.Civ.P. 65(a)(1), the Petitioner filed Proposed Complaint for Injunction and Restraining Order, 1:19-cv-00081, on 5/3/19 on the above-mentioned related cases under 28 U.S. Code § 1331 Federal Question, 28 U.S. Code § 1343(a)(3);(4) Civil rights and elective franchise, 42 U.S. Code § 1983 Civil action for deprivation of rights, and in 28 U.S. Code § 1915(e)(1) Proceedings in Forma Pauperis for order of Cease and Desist in criminal tort under the color of law. The Petitioner was unaware at the time to Motion under 42 U.S. Code § 1981 Equal rights under the law and no decision has been made on the proposed complaint. Appendix and copy of Proposed Complaint appears at Appendix . []
5. In light of the State of North Dakota not participating in the Appeal as a real party of interest, pursuant to N.D.R.App.P Rule 44, the Petitioner served the Petitions for Rehearing in 30-07-C-00374 and 08-2017-DM-00999, is serving this Petition, and submitted original complaint on 10/16/2017 to Wayne Stenehjem, North Dakota Attorney General.

Reasons Extension and Relief is Justified

Supreme Court Rule 13.5 provides that “An application to extend the time to file shall set out the basis for jurisdiction in this Court, identify the judgment sought to be reviewed, include a copy of the opinion and any order respecting rehearing, and set out specific reasons why an extension of time is justified.” Sup. Ct. R. 13.5. The specific reasons why an extension of time is justified are as follows:

1. The Petition for Writ of Certiorari that is to be filed by June 13, 2019 in case Hagen v. Horst 20180344 is a grant of claim in violation of Amendment XIV Section 4 on a previous grant of claim on the loss of emancipation of a non-emancipated slave in violation of Amendment XIV Section 4 to be filed by August 14, 2019 in case Horst v. Horst 20180402.
2. Due Process is removed to the applicant with two parties bringing action to the courts simultaneously in a coordinated strategy to remove due process to the applicant.
3. The application is being filed with Motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis and pursuant to Sup. Ct. R. 33.1(d) and Sup. Ct. R. 22 application to exceed word limit with the extraordinary circumstances for relief from a 15-day requirement of two cases on the grant of claim on the loss of emancipation of a slave as limitations are held void and illegal under Amendment XIV Section 4.
 - (a) Draft and proposed Petition is included to provide due process to the Supreme Court of the United States, United States District Court for the State of North Dakota (Western), and the Respondents.
 - (b) Draft and proposed Petition is included also in part because it is physically impossible to summarize War Crimes within any due process established under the Rules of the Courts and the extension of time to file for the Applicant is also an extension of time to review for the Courts and Respondents.
4. The Applicant is Pro Se under cause of action voiding as illegal claims on loss of emancipation which would include attorney fees and the United States has provided no safeguard and provided court appointed counsel.

5. Application is addressed to Chief Justice John Roberts pursuant to the closest relation to appeals on War Crimes Sup. Ct. R. 22.3 as the United States has not provided due process to its citizens for War Crimes committed by the United States.

Amendment XIV Section 4 voids as illegal any contracts, Judgments, and Orders on the loss of emancipation of a non-emancipated slave.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons and good cause shown, Applicants respectfully request that this Court grant this application for an extension of time to file a petition for writ of certiorari, relief to exceed word and page limits, and grant of stay in leave to proceed in forma pauperis.

Amendment XIV Section 4 “The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned.”