# 19-5173

## ORIGINAL

FILED

JUL 0 5 2019

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
OURSE COURT, U.S.

\_\_\_\_

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Sohnny Kirkland - PETITIONER (Your Name)

vs.

Huntington Ingal Incorporated RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

United States Court of Appeals For the Fifth Circuit (NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

(Your Name)

(Address)

Casherry Alabama 36432 (City, State, Zip Code)

251-362-4498 (Phone Number)

### **QUESTION(S) PRESENTED**

- (1) Whether Huntington Ingols Incorporation Mas negligence under Vessel owner:
- (2) Whether My Underage Employment in 1971 documents can be pulled up in Ingalls under Hercules Armstrong Social Security number as evidence. That IMAS my exhibit.
- (3.) Whether the Statute Of Limitation is time barred for my Underage INUTKing claim.
- (4). Mhether the United States District Court
  Properly dismissed My Case.

### 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. Johnny Kirkland Plaintiff- Petitioner 124 Jefferson Street Castleberry, AL36432
- 2. Hunting Inapples Incorporated is a Inholly owned Subsidiary of Huntington Ingalls Industries, Inc., a publicly held corporation (NYSE: HIT C/OI. General coursel-Litigation 5220 River Road-Avondate, LA 70094
- 3. Richard P. Salloum, Lead Attorney for Defendant Franke & Salloum, PLLC PU: Drainer 460 GUIFPOrt, MS 39502 Telephone: 228-868-7070 Facsimile: 228-868-7090
  - 4. Traci Castille, Attorney for Defendant Franke & Salloum, Plle P. O Box Drawer 460 Guiffort. MS 39502 Telephone: 228-868-7070 Facsimile: 228-868-7090

### **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	4\$5
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	b
CONCLUSION	γ

### **INDEX TO APPENDICES**

APPENDIX A U.S Didiid COUFT - SUmmary Judgement

APPENDIX B United States Court of Appeal (Fifth Circuit) Judgement of District court affirmed.

APPENDIX C Petition for Panel Rehearing. denied.

APPENDIX D United states Court of Appeals (F. 4th circuit)
Stay of the mandate -

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

# TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

~Lovis" PAGE NUMBER Controd V. Holder 825 So. 2d 16,18 (Miss 2002) ---- 5
Kathryn Swianson V. MicDermott International Inclother
Mutord Inc. V. Peterson, 368 50,2d 213 (Miss. 1979) -Milgore V. Crown Liques of Broward Inc. 448 So 2d (Fla 1984)
Milgore V. Crown Liques of Broward Inc. 448 So 2d (Fla 1984)
Onlens Illinois, 1NC V. Edingras 573 SO. 2d 704 (Miss 19 3 cinda Steam NAN. COLtd V. Santas 451 US 156 (1981) 4. Koopers Inc. 42 SO. 34 (Niss 2010)

Miss cude Sec 71-1-17-child Labour land 15-1-49 - Discovery rule 905B-Jessel Dwner STATUTES AND RULES

### 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 Appenthe petition and is	dix to
		[ ] 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 the petition and is	to
		[ ] reported at; or, [ ] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or, [ ] is unpublished.	
[]	For	cases from state courts:	
		The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears Appendix to the petition and is	at
		[ ] reported at; or, [ ] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or, [ ] is unpublished.	
		The opinion of the appears at Appendix to the petition and is	court
		[ ] 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 1970, 18, 2014.
[ ] 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 NoA
The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).
[ ] For cases from state courts:
The date on which the highest state court decided my case was  A copy of that decision appears at Appendix
[ ] A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date:
[ ] An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including (date) on (date) in Application NoA
The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S. C. § 1257(a).

### CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

child Labor Laws restrict how old Children must be to mork, when they can mork, and Inhat Jobs they can do. These laws are in place to ensure that Children do not do any mork that's dangerous or bad for their health, and to quarantee that Childrens focus remines on their education.

### STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This case arises out of being hired in Huntington Ingalis Incomparated in 1977 as a Underage minor, which I was 13 yes old, where I was exposed

I worked under my cousin Hercules Armstrong Social security number. In other mords the shared social security number. Being a minor, we both thought it mas just a number you to get in the vessel. I or my cousin dignt know any better. The vessel owner never check for proper ID. After the summer I went toget to school. I when toget to mork in the shippard to part to the year 1978. I asked the shippard to poll in the year 1978. I asked the shippard to poll up my records where I worked in 1971 as a minor up my records where I maked in 1971 as a minor back my cousin social security number. They keep solving I only worked in 1978.

Therefore I am suing Huntington Ingalls INC Under the Dual Copacity Doctrine in its capacity as Vessel owner, and negetigene (905b).

The vessel owner had a duty to keep minors off the Vessel inhich , the Child or employee might Ut the Vessel Inhich the Unid or employee might reasonably be expected to remain in ignorance, and it should have been discovered by the exercise of Justordinary Care. See(Scinda Steam exercise of Justordinary Care. See(Scinda Steam Nav. co., Ltd v. Santos, 451 Us, 156 (1981). As a Nav. co., Ltd v. Santos, 451 Us, 156 (1981). As a Vessel owner the remployer had a duty to Marn of Vessel owner the remployer had a duty to Marn of dangers because as bestos is a latentinjury. The shippowners had actual knowlege that their Mas Shippowners had actual knowlege that their Mas Shippowners as bestor on the Shippownerd they dangerous as bestor on the Shippownerd. manufactured asbestos. See Kathryn Simanson V. McDermott International INC, 5th Circ, Louisiana.

The Vessel Olyner or Inhover INAS in Charge treach the duty to check for proper ID. See Mutord THE V. Peterson, 368 SO. 29 SI3 Miss. 1979, Milgore V. Crown Liguous of Broward INC 448 SO 20 (Fla 1984). As a minor the vessel owner should have match out for minors by checking their ID because I Didn't know any Detter and inastired on a vessel where there in as horardous asbestos fibers, and insulation in cleaning up the ship, rust Grinding, sandblasting, and painting. A minute of the as a Laborer in a construction site and this hired as a Laborer in a construction site and this exposure of my as bestos exposure of hired as a Laborer in a couse of my as bestos exposure of hired the proximate cause of my as bestos employed in a minor under the age of 14 may be employed in a minor under the age of 14 may be employed in a minor under the age of 14 may be employed. in a mill, connery, Morshop, or manufacturing establishment Under any Circumstance (Miss code Sec. 714-17.)

# STATUE OF LIMITATIONS

The statue of limitations does not start to run until there is a cause of action which accords, in a personal injury case, or the Discovery rule (Miss code Section 15-1-49).

The Underage working is connected with the asbestos exposure which is a latent injury which doesn't start to run until a cause of action, accures. See owers-Illinois, Inc v. Edwards 573 so. 2d 704 See owers-Illinois, Inc v. Koopers Inc, 42 so. 3d (Miss 1990) and Angle v. Koopers Inc, 42 so. 3d

(Miss 2010).

The United States District Court granted Summary Tudgement to Huntington Ingalls Incorporation without and interrogations or deposition. See conrod v. Holder, 825 so. 2d 16.18 (NN'SS. 2002. The United States District court of Appeals Affirmed, (5th circuit).
Mith the U.S. District court.

### **REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION**

The reason for granting this Petition is for the United States Supreme Court to review the United States Supreme Court to review the decision of the Appeal from the United States District Court on Underage Age Morking, and asbedos exposure.

The results I expect is compensation for Pain & Suffering, medical, loss of earning, loss of family, psychological and emotional injuries, prejudge interest, and loss of enjoyment of Life.

TO the honorable judges, I Johnny Kirkland Mould appreciate the Granting of this Petition, because I Mas hired underage as a minor and have mesothelisma as being expose to Osbestos. Notody Protected me as a Minor. If they had Notody Protected me as a Minor. If they had check me for proper ID I Mould have never check me for proper ID I Mould have never been on the Vessel in the first place. I Didn't been on the Vessel in the first place. I Didn't even know what a social security number was

Asbestos is a very important issue, and Concern to the PUBLIC because it is a deadly health problem that can be expose from person to person.

### **CONCLUSION**

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

2,2019