19-5179

No.

ORIGINAL

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Eastern District of Virginia, Alexandria, VA Fairfax County Division

Susan E. Pattishall — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

Vinton G. Cerf et al. — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

US Court of Appeals, Fourth Circuit

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

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Susan E. Pattishall
(Your Name)

6 2nd St.
(Address)

Crisfield, MD 21817
(City, State, Zip Code)

(410) 422-6709
(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

QUESTION 1

The Plaintiff-Appellee does not find the value of the Virginia statutory limitation law Va. Code § 8.01-243(B) holds true for intellectual property. Intellectual property is different from physical property. An intellectual text is intellectual property. Intellectual property should not be included property by the definitions of property in the statute of limitations. The ruling is unjust because it deprives the Plaintiff-Appellee of her unalienable and intrinsic right to her own work.

• The 14th Amendment of the US Constitution says the Plaintiff-Appellee has "unalienable rights" and "nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property", and the right to the "equal protection" of them *(14th Amendment, Section 1 of US Constitution, July 9, 1868).*

• The Declaration of Independence says the Plaintiff-Appellee has "unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness" *(The Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1776).*

• The first Amendment assures the Plaintiff-Appellee to the right to "freedom of speech" and "exercise of" her religion.

The essays comprising the Plaintiff-Appellee's religion and spirit in the exercising thereof should be ordered returned to her. The theft the Defendant-Appellees are lying they did not carry out denies the Plaintiff-Appellee the right to the "freedom of speech" of her own essays and the freedom to her religious philosophy and religious belief the Plaintiff-Appellee was writing about. The Plaintiff-Appellee was then studying and preparing to be a teacher. On her behalf is the Plaintiff-Appellee graduated with a Master of Education in Learning and Technology and can be employed as an educator/teacher or professor. Work as a regular employee for someone else is hard to find because the Plaintiff-Appellee is moderately deaf in both ears. The Plaintiff-Appellee, however, is an accomplished author and needs her essays to make a living at writing. Meanwhile, the Defendant-Appellees use and sell the work that is intellectual property. The Defendant-Appellees have been awarded an unjust time bar over intellectual property, even though the Defendant-Appellees claim, perjuriously, their association with the Plaintiff-Appellee never happened and the property, although it is intellectual property, never existed to them so they did not steal it..

The essays comprising the Plaintiff-Appellee's religion and spirit in the exercising thereof should be ordered returned to the Plaintiff-Appellee because the Defendant-Appellees did steal it.

The criminal activities in which the Defendant-Appellees with DARPA helping Aspen Systems, Inc. were involved, sabotaging the aircraft at MROs and aboard the aircraft carriers and selling documents to spies, represent the real characters of the Defendant-Appellees. Those crimes might come under the statute of limitations to the court, but how can the court say this when "[t]here is no statute of limitations for treason or for federal terrorism charges"? *(https://www.expertlaw.com/search/node/for%20treason). According to Title 18 of the United States Code, §2381.* Treason:

> "There is no statute of limitations for federal crimes punishable by death, nor for certain federal crimes of terrorism, nor for certain federal sex offenses.

Prosecution for most other federal crimes must begin within five years of the commitment of the offense" *(United States Code, §2381).*

The Plaintiff-Appellee is telling the truth. The Plaintiff-Appellee is not a liar when the Plaintiff-Appellee states the Defendant-Appellees robbed her. The Defendant -Appellees were traitors who sold documents to spies . If the court can award the desperate need of the time bar statute of limitations to those Defendant-Appellees, the Plaintiff-Appellee sees no reason the court does not use the statute's corrected interpretation for intellectual property because the Plaintiff-Appellee is not a liar. The Plaintiff-Appellee is not guilty of perjury. The Defendant-Appellees most certainly are guilty of perjury.

The document comprising the Plaintiff-Appellee's stolen essays comes under intellectual property. This is a different property than property under the statute of limitations. The awarding of a time bar of intellectual property in the case in which the Defendant-Appellees deny the property's existence should be more clearly seen as an obscure and unjust reasoning, which has the effect of awarding these criminals the Plaintiff-Appellee's good character.

QUESTION 2

If the Defendant-Appellees will not return the Plaintiff-Appellee's essays, the world will learn of the deeds the Defendant-Appellees carried out to have gotten where they are today no matter how long ago it was. It is because of who the Defendant-Appellees were the deeds will go down in history. The better course of action is to return the Plaintiff-Appellee writings, and the Plaintiff-Appellee will not publish the other deeds under their statute of limitations.

Defendant-Appellees Vinton Cerf and Robert Kahn sold my stolen manuscript (and likely the public's lucrative submissions to DARPA) to interested spies of hostile foreign countries. Because of the theory of relativity within, the Plaintiff-Appellee's work enhances comprehension of its topics and those lexicons. The personal writing system the Plaintiff-Appellee developed increases the understanding of the scientific and social science methods and theories discussed in her just begun thesis. Thereby, it has the capability to divulge scientific comprehension to US enemies who, being enemies, will not see or use the information as the Plaintiff-Appellee would. They'll use it to spy on us, just as the Defendant-Appellees Cerf and Kahn helped the spies they sold and still sell the document to do.

It deprives US education of the scientific information, despite the Defendant-Appellee Vinton Cerf's plagiaristic voice of God lecture and presumed publication of the Christian Plaintiff-Appellee's religious and philosophic beliefs in Israel. The Plaintiff-Appellee considers it a grave issue her manuscript was being black-marketed out of the country against the US and US students, and now it is used to plaster an improved intellect onto Defendant-Appellee Vinton Cerf.

The Plaintiff-Appellee insists the fact she is a US American means her essays belong to her for the United States, but the Plaintiff-Appellee lost in the attempt to sue. Then the Plaintiff-Appellee appealed and lost again. The Plaintiff-Appellee is appealing to the Supreme Court to see reason the essays are intellectual property and asks the court to please order the Defendant-Appellees turn over her intellectual property they are abusing and ignorantly and seditiously sharing with nations with animosity toward the US. The Plaintiff-Appellee's work is one in physics and

religion the Defendant-Appellees did not want to return after getting it away and running away from the Plaintiff-Appellee.

The court has the power, regarding nuclear energy, by code § 67-1402. Purposes; powers of Authority, B(11), to make policy for intellectual property. "Develop a policy regarding any interest in intellectual property that may be acquired or developed by the Consortium;" and the Plaintiff-Appellee would agree, considering there are small quotes and the cited definition of physics from the textbooks at Old Dominion University, and expanded upon on quantum theory and atomic, relativity by Plaintiff-Appellee Susan E. Pattishall. Giving back the essays to Plaintiff-Appellee Susan E. Pattishall makes the most sense.

In addition, in the State of Virginia Code § 18.2-434. What deemed perjury; punishment and penalty, it is stated..... "if any person in any written declaration, certificate, verification, or statement under penalty of perjury pursuant to § 8.01-4.3 willfully subscribes as true any material matter which he does not believe is true, he is guilty of perjury, punishable as a Class 5 felony. Upon the conviction of any person for perjury, such person thereby shall be adjudged forever incapable of holding any office of honor, profit, or trust under the Constitution of Virginia, or of serving as a juror."

The Plaintiff-Appellee wonders why the existence of this code does not worry the Defendant-Appellees more, particularly Defendant-Appellee Vinton G. Cerf who holds an office of honor by working for the United Nations. The Plaintiff-Appellee fears telling the lie they have never associated with the Plaintiff-Appellee and hiding the truth of their theft of the Plaintiff-Appellee's work for their uses and the uses of their US enemy customers will ultimately appear much simpler to have gone with the truth. This case, after all, was filed for the return of the Plaintiff-Appellee's intellectual property essays. The Defendant-Appellees are of poor characters and should not be allowed to serve in honorable positions.

The Plaintiff-Appellee swears the Plaintiff-Appellee is telling the truth and the Defendant-Appellees are lying. The Plaintiff-Appellee's only evidence is the Plaintiff-Appellee was there being robbed. The fact is an indisputable one to the Plaintiff-Appellee's memory. Intellectual property should not be ignored for its personality and changed into another type of property.

In the situation, the court does not care the Defendant-Appellees are known to have passed documents or a document (the Plaintiff-Appellee's essays) to John Anthony Walker, spy for Russia, and to Jonathan Jay and Anne Pollard, spies for Israel. The Plaintiff-Appellee does not know why the court does not care about the Defendant-Appellees' deeds concerning the espionage, but the Plaintiff-Appellee is offended to be unwillingly involved in the treason of the Defendant-Appellees by her essays, these essays which constitute the Plaintiff-Appellee's voice.

Under Virginia Code §10.1-1409, 8(d). Revocation or amendment of permits, the state should consider the statute of limitations law for the criminal and treasonable things the Defendant-Appellees were doing at the exact same time they stole the Plaintiff-Appellee's work of essays from her. The Defendant-Appellees willingly contributed to murders of military pilots and passengers, regardless of what the Defendant-Appellees say or don't say they were doing by installing or assisting the installing counterfeit aircraft parts, switching good parts for counterfeit. Aspen Systems, Inc., with a NASA award to test epoxy and DARPA would have needed permission from

the USN and, when this was legitimate business, there should be a USN record of their visits to aircraft carriers. When they do not have one, the forgiving statute of limitations code prevails.

The Defendant-Appellees' deeds are exactly what the public needs to know about. The DARPA and Aspen Systems, Inc. switching good for counterfeit aircraft parts into aircraft to test epoxy were never officially known about. The FAA and the DOT hid the fact, blaming one MRO owner, Bryan Snyder of Classic Aviation. There has been speculation one of the facts they hid was the parts were switched aboard the aircraft carriers, and instead reported only an MRO to protect morale and themselves from public outcry. Snyder's business helped them say zero switching of parts occurred aboard US aircraft carriers, protecting DARPA, DOT, FAA, and USN security. Today, it protects US computer scientists Vinton Cerf and Robert Kahn from having ever been near the aircraft carriers and the Plaintiff-Appellee.

The Plaintiff-Appellee sees this is the statute of limitations followed by the state of Virginia, albeit it is not for the theft of her intellectual property. If it was, the Plaintiff-Appellee's invaluable essays would come under petit larceny of the same code, an irrelevant and useless fact to the court in this case and the essays are of course intellectual property. However, as the intellectual property essays are real, if the court would view the Plaintiff-Appellee's essays as intellectual property, a case would be heard. The robbery speaks for the Defendant-Appellees' characters because they were up to these other things; and, the federal court is trying to make it so by emphasizing the statute of limitations on the Plaintiff-Appellee intellectual property, property that doesn't exist according to the Defendant-Appellees. It is intellectual property the Defendant-Appellees trade for money and used in their climb to prestige. They may have used it to throw attention off the other crimes they were involved in.

The Plaintiff-Appellee believes they wanted to spy on Goddard Space. Outside the courtroom, the Defendant-Appellees brag to the Plaintiff-Appellee about the theft and how they don't have to return the essays because of who they are. Defendant-Appellee Robert Kahn's lawyer sent a letter to the Plaintiff-Appellee not to bother the Defendant-Appellee Robert Kahn's reputation or else, yet the Defendant-Appellee continues to harass the Plaintiff-Appellee by to wanting to trade the essays.

The Plaintiff-Appellee wants her essays and cannot help telling the public who the Defendant-Appellees really are if the Defendant-Appellees do not return the essays and/or the court does not deliver due process of law to return the essays to the Plaintiff-Appellee.

QUESTION 3

The Defendant-Appellees lied to the federal court. Perjury to the court is a felony.

QUESTION 4

The Plaintiff-Appellee is not trying to exercise a surprise circumstance. The Plaintiff-Appellee only recently, late 2016, found out who and where the Defendant-Appellees were. The statute of limitations law would be unfair to the Plaintiff-Appellee, as this law should not apply when the property is intellectual property. Returning the Plaintiff-Appellee's intellectual property and authorship would not be grossly unfair to the Defendant-Appellees in any way. The Defendant-Appellees, by returning the Plaintiff-Appellee's material, would certainly not be treated "grossly

unfair" (US Court of Appeals for the 4th Circuit, 2019), because they would have copies of the essays and their wealth and fame by the Plaintiff-Appellee's essays have already been accrued.

QUESTION 5

The Plaintiff-Appellee will publish what the Defendant-Appellees did with a disclaimer against libel. It is the Plaintiff-Appellee who does not deserve the emotional punishment of deprivation and heartbreak robbing the Plaintiff-Appellee of her essays caused the Plaintiff-Appellee. The Defendant-Appellees' act destroyed the Plaintiff-Appellee emotionally for many years. The Plaintiff-Appellee's effort and opportunity were destroyed. The Defendant-Appellees relish it and are excited by their own cruelty. The Plaintiff-Appellee wrote to the Defendant-Appellees Vinton Cerf and tried to reason with him about it in this way and he ignored the Plaintiff-Appellee's communication. The Plaintiff-Appellee wrote a letter to the Defendant-Appellee Robert Kahn to reason with him over the return of her essays in lieu of the Plaintiff-Appellee's future publication. This communication was ignored.

QUESTION 6

When the court favors the Defendant-Appellees Vinton G. Cerf and Robert E. Kahn, the court awards them the authorship of the Plaintiff-Appellee's work. The Plaintiff-Appellee cannot believe in that. Intellectual property is authorship. Authorship represents personality and efficacy. Authorship's spirit and value are not physical property. The Plaintiff-Appellee believes the Virginia law of statute of limitations should be amended for cases of intellectual property, especially when the intellectual property belongs to the pursuit of a livelihood. The pursuit of a living is construed by the Declaration of Independence as: "certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness" *(The Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1776)*. The Plaintiff-Appellee still needs a livelihood and the essays are hers, not the Defendant-Appellees Vinton Cerf's or Robert Kahn's. These men want to tell everyone they wrote what the Plaintiff-Appellee really authored.

QUESTION 7

To keep the Plaintiff-Appellee's essays from her, the Defendant-Appellees are discriminating against the Plaintiff-Appellee with the reasoning of sexism. Defendant-Appellees Vinton G. Cerf and Robert E. Kahn prove the 19th amendment needs to be amended to protect the talent, efficacy, and productivity of women. To the Defendant-Appellees, it is one thing women can vote, but it's totally another if women are going to have serious talent toward a career. The Plaintiff-Appellee questions this last, but not least, fact. It is the attitude of discrimination against the Plaintiff-Appellee as a woman in a career.

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:

1. Susan E. Pattishall
2. Vinton G. Cerf
3. Robert E. Kahn

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INDEX TO APPENDICES

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

[x] For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at **Appendix A** to the petition and is

[ ] reported at_____; or, [ ] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or, **[x]** is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at **Appendix B** 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**:

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

[x] For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was April 30, 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._____.

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: _____, 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).

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

6. First Amendment. First Amendment, Constitution of United States of America 1789 (rev. 1992). 2, 9, 13, 19

7. Appellee Robert E. Kahn's Informal Brief, Susan E. Pattishall v. Vinton G. Cerf et al, (2019), US Court of Appeals for the 4th Circuit, p. 5. ..."surprise circumstance"..... "grossly unfair"..... 5, 9, 14, 19, 20, 21, 22

8. Code §67-1402. Purposes; powers of Authority, B(11) *(Code of Virginia, https://law.lis.virginia.gov/vacode/title67/chapter14/section67-1402/)* 4, 9, 13

9. Code § 18.2-434. *(Code of Virginia https://law.lis.virginia.gov/vacode/title18.2/chapter10/section18.2-434/).* 4, 9, 14

OTHER

1. Code §10.1-1409. Revocation or amendment of permits, 8(d). *(Code of Virginia, https://law.lis.virginia.gov/vacode/title10.1/chapter14/section10.1-1409/).* 4, 9

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

1. 14th Amendment, Section 1 of US Constitution

All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws *(14th Amendment, Section 1 of US Constitution, July 9, 1868).*

2. The Unanimous Declaration of the Thirteen United States of America

> When in the Course of human events it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.
>
> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness. — That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, — That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to affect their Safety and Happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly, all experience hath shewn that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their future security. ... *(The Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1776).*

3. First Amendment, Constitution of United States of America

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances. *(First Amendment, Constitution of United States of America 1789 (rev. 1992)).*

4. Code § 67-1402. Purposes; powers of Authority, B(11), ... intellectual property. "Develop a policy regarding any interest in intellectual property that may be acquired or developed by the Consortium;" *(Code of Virginia, https://law.lis.virginia.gov/vacode/title67/chapter14/section67-1402/).*

5. Code § 18.2-434. What deemed perjury; punishment and penalty. ..... "if any person in any written declaration, certificate, verification, or statement under penalty of perjury pursuant to § 8.01-4.3 willfully subscribes as true any material matter which he does not believe is true, he is guilty of perjury, punishable as a Class 5 felony. Upon the conviction of any person for perjury, such person thereby shall be adjudged forever incapable of holding any office of honor, profit, or trust under the Constitution of Virginia, or of serving as a juror." *(Code of Virginia https://law.lis.virginia.gov/vacode/title18.2/chapter10/section18.2-434/).*

6. Title 18 of the United States Code, §2381. Treason:
"There is no statute of limitations for federal crimes punishable by death, nor for certain federal crimes of terrorism, nor for certain federal sex offenses. Prosecution for most other federal crimes must begin within five years of the commitment of the offense" *(United States Code, §2381).*

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The Plaintiff-Appellee's essays from the first three years of college were stolen from the Plaintiff-Appellee in 1980. While writing her second book, a textbook on art and technology literacy, the Plaintiff-Appellee discovered the identities of the thieves who did it, the Defendant-Appellees. It wasn't for thirty-eight years, so the federal court time-barred the Plaintiff-Appellee's lawsuit request in favor of the renown of the Defendant-Appellees, or thieves, thereby denying the return of her intellectual property.

The lawsuit by Plaintiff-Appellee Susan E. Pattishall points out the Defendant-Appellees, Vinton G. Cerf and Robert E. Kahn, after stealing the Plaintiff-Appellee's essays, sold the essays to spies during the John Anthony Walker and Jonathan Jay Pollard spy treason, yet the US Court of Appeals, 4th Circuit ruling awards the Defendant-Appellees the Plaintiff-Appellee's essays by virtue of the statute of limitations (Code § 8.01-243(B))..

The Plaintiff-Appellee does not understand why the court pays no attention to her information the Defendant-Appellees were involved in treason. The Defendant-Appellees, in the 1980's, were committing aircraft sabotage for Aspen Systems, Inc.. Whether this was out of DARPA (Defense Advanced Research Agency) where they were employed, or a personal endeavor is not clear. Then, one must perceive DARPA to have been hiding a spy ring, and outside the court room the Defendant-Appellees admit they sold the Plaintiff-Appellee's essays to spies. If the court overlooks that, the Plaintiff-Appellee does not see how she can. The Plaintiff-Appellee will publish an exposé of the entire Cold War situation in which these Defendant-Appellees were involved. The Defendant-Appellees are rumored to currently sell the Plaintiff-Appellee's essays with illicit and recreational drug sales, as well as to the spies and prime ministers of hostile foreign countries.

In federal court, the Plaintiff-Appellee was to understand the Defendant-Appellees denied stealing any document from the Plaintiff-Appellee or having had any association with the Plaintiff-Appellee. The Plaintiff-Appellee was interested in only the return of her work, even though the Plaintiff-Appellee deserves monetary damages for her contribution to the effectiveness of the

Defendant-Appellees who would not be deprived of the text by returning the Plaintiff-Appellee's work, as they would likely keep copies. It would not be grossly unfair to the Defendant-Appellees, as they have already made enough money with the Plaintiff-Appellee's essays, thus sharing it with enough other people. They did not thank the Plaintiff-Appellee or pay the Plaintiff-Appellee a fee for the material. The Defendant-Appellees brag about this and it is offensive to the Plaintiff-Appellee. Authorship cannot be converted unless someone agrees to it or ghostwrites for someone else. The Plaintiff-Appellee never agreed to anything and the Defendant-Appellees are lying under oath when they state they didn't steal the essays and had no association with the Plaintiff-Appellee.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

The Plaintiff-Appellee presumes the court is wondering why the Plaintiff-Appellee's essays are special, and governments want the Plaintiff-Appellee's manuscript. The Plaintiff-Appellee's essays are on added information to scientific ideas and experiments; physics jargon; and creative ideas blending the various social sciences and educational fields into modern information amazingly easy to comprehend. There are the Plaintiff-Appellee's own proposed theories in the work. A few personal and creative essays were also in the envelope, identifying the Plaintiff-Appellee. Defendant-Appellee Vinton Cerf stating to everyone he stole it to claim he wrote it because he couldn't see a woman being smarter than he is, and this be the end of the argument, is ridiculous and not an adequate explanation for US Americans. Women are of course smart. Some are scientists and businesswomen. It is unacceptable bigotry and discrimination for the Defendant-Appellees to say words to the effect: 'we took them away from her, a low-class person'. The Plaintiff-Appellee is not low-class and is neither a drug dealer nor substance abuser such as the Defendant-Appellees.

The Plaintiff-Appellee cannot see Defendant-Appellee Vinton G. Cerf and his accessory, Defendant-Appellee Robert E. Kahn, being above the law. The Plaintiff-Appellee, who is on SSI, requested a waiver for court costs to sue the Defendant-Appellees because the Defendant-Appellees are lying about her and about not robbing her of her material. The work the Defendant-Appellees' sell to prime ministers and use for their own projects is really the Plaintiff-Appellee's intellectual property and ought to be returned to the Plaintiff-Appellee.

The Plaintiff-Appellee cannot, under aegis by her Constitution Rights, accept being denied due process of law, as obviously premeditated as the Defendant-Appellees' theft was. In the Plaintiff-Appellee's opinion, no one sound of mind would be able to believe in congratulating the Defendant-Appellees on conversion of the Plaintiff-Appellee's authorship to the Defendant-Appellees' because of the time-bar statute of limitations. It is not only intellectual property but writing knowledgably identifiable as the Plaintiff-Appellee's material. The material was without copyright registration because it was stolen when it was fresh, and it was partly a college assignment, or schoolwork. The court should see it is the Plaintiff-Appellee's intellectual property and the essays are uniquely the Plaintiff-Appellee's own.

The rulings thus far are where the Plaintiff-Appellee cannot deny a change is needed to a law when that law upholds the premeditated thievery by the Defendant-Appellees; their Cold War crimes; and the downright sneaky sabotage to the aircraft of their own countrymen. Then it is time to "throw off such Government" evils as cannot be denied are "a long train of abuses and usurpations" *(The Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1776).*

Because the Defendant-Appellees are lying under oath, the argument cannot be opened. If implied copyright and intellectual property were recognized as enduring, which in the Plaintiff-Appellee's opinion these ideas would be, it could be captured importantly as the argument there cannot be conversion of property that is intellectual property; but, in this case, there cannot be conversion of property where there is no property at all to the court because the Defendant-Appellees lied to the court they never stole from the Plaintiff-Appellee. That is perjury by the Defendant-Appellees. Time bar or no time-bar, these are serious grounds to question the Defendant-Appellees.

As it stands, there's in forma pauperis stigma on the authentic kind of justice, quoting Defendant-Appellee Vinton Cerf's lawyer, Attorney James Miller: "An in forma pauperis plaintiff must meet certain minimum standards of rationality. For example, fantastic claims, as Adams (who is the other lawyer) says, are clearly baseless and subject to dismissal". ... et cetera. In other words, this states the Plaintiff-Appellee was the one making fantastic claims. This is not true. Why are Plaintiff-Appellee claims baseless? They aren't. The proper authorities should question the claims on selling documents to foreign countries and aircraft tampering, not just stealing the Plaintiff-Appellee's manuscript. Shouldn't the court worry they still do it, instead of the Plaintiff-Appellee's claim is baseless by an irrational claimant who is a freelance journalist? The Plaintiff-Appellee was set up by the Defendant-Appellees and robbed. The matter is theft of intellectual property. The description of the theft carried out by the Defendant-Appellees is below. The trickery was malicious.

Description of events by the Plaintiff-Appellee as follows:

> I went out looking for my friend I'd had a date with there. When I got to the hang-out, no one was there because the aircraft carriers were out at sea. I drank a couple of small glasses of beer, and I'd had one before I left home. It was getting late and I needed to go home. Just then, the barmaid called over to me.
>
> "Hey, this guy said he'd run you home."
>
> "Okay, great! Thank you," I replied, thinking he was a local patron and someone she knew.
>
> We got into his car parked in the lot adjoining the bar across the street. In 1980, Vinton Cerf was a lanky kid-like man with an unusual, big nose and a bowl type haircut. He had a full head of hair he wore in a just under the ears in a page-boy style, longish with long bangs that rested on his forehead right up to the bridge to his nose. It was a passé style for 1980, I thought. Not to laugh, I think I politely asked him whether he was in a band. He said no. I tried to engage him in conversation by asking him whether he went to university, since he was dressed like a collegiate. He replied he did. Then we discussed where we both went to university and what our names were. His sounded like a strange name to me, so I had to make sure it wasn't "Vincent". I managed the niceties of politeness and thanking him for the ride.

I said, "What do you know, isn't it a coincidence here I am in Norfolk where I happened to have lived when "Blue Velvet" was a popular song by Bobby Vinton."

Vinton Cerf was not sociable and said nothing; so, I said, "I played that song so many times on my little record player, it must have driven my mother nuts." I was just trying to get along. I hoped this was breaking the ice, while he sat in the driver seat of his car with a countenance of serious and stern boredom. Despite he didn't want to say much, he turned to me.

"Give me a kiss," he said without a hint of passion.

I said, "What! I'm not even home yet."

He insisted I kiss him, so I did, but he just held still with his lips tightly closed. I gave him a little peck on the lips and thought, why is this guy acting like a lame kisser if he wanted one? I noticed he appeared to be concentrating on staring straight ahead out the windshield, probably at the reflection of my envelope like he was nailing it with a hex. My essays were in the envelope from Vantage Press resting on the dashboard where I'd placed it to kiss him. Then he pretended he couldn't start the car.

"Go into the bar, so I can get the car started," he said.

"I'm okay with that. I don't have to go into the bar," I said.

"No, wait in the bar," he insisted. Then he mumbled something like, "and I will come around."

Possibly, I just didn't catch all the 'not like you will' under his breath right away. Don't ask me why I believed it. I was not drunk. Thinking it was a real start the car and to not argue with him, I obediently got out of the car without taking my envelope, no thanks to it was raining. When too much time went by in the bar, I started looking around outside. Suddenly, I was distraught with realizing what had happened. I went back into the bar to ask the barmaid who the guy was. She said she didn't know him. Good grief! What?! She brought me a cup of coffee, although I was now sober as could be. That coffee seemed to have arrived fast, I thought. She helped that bratty kid take my theory of relativity and he did not even go to my university, not even to one in Virginia. I was tricked. The barmaid, Natalie (last name unknown), does know the Defendant-Appellees very well. Since the Plaintiff-Appellee does not know her last name, it was not possible to summon her.

Then, lo and behold, like a gallant knight, who should appear along with my cup of coffee but the other guy on the TCP/IP Wikipedia page, Robert E. Kahn. He sat down opposite me and asked me what was wrong. I told him. He

> was sympathetic and offered to really take me home. I was so sickened by the theft deed his partner had done I had to accept. During the ride home, I told him how much the lost writing meant to me and asked him to help me get it back, but he claimed to not know his colleague, Vinton Cerf, whose name I might have not remembered temporarily, because anything helpful said in the car simply flew out of my mind as soon as I realized I'd been tricked, but then I did remember it. Robert Kahn claimed he didn't know Vinton Cerf.

If the stealing of the Plaintiff-Appellee's written material was a mischief that, at first, appeared to the Defendant-Appellees to be a devise for how the Defendant-Appellees intended to conceal their alcoholism and drug abuse, they read the material and realized what they had was too important, so keeping it was quite a windfall. This theory is likely not the best choice, as the John Anthony Walker espionage was taking place. It is more likely they were looking for a document to trade for money.

The Plaintiff-Appellee wanted to tell this story in detail to describe how the robbery was carried out. The Plaintiff-Appellee is telling the truth. The Plaintiff-Appellee will be drafting a fictive characterization around the true story with a disclaimer because the Defendant-Appellees will want to slap a lawsuit on her, claiming libel. The version of the robbery above is 100% true, however. After a case has been settled by a judge it is a public record. When the Plaintiff-Appellee publishes the nonfiction version, it will be 100% true.

The Plaintiff-Appellee wants the court to grant this petition because the court shouldn't think the Plaintiff-Appellee is making a baseless claim. The Plaintiff-Appellee wants the court to grant this petition because the court would want her to save the lives of pilots who must navigate jets and transport aircraft. The Plaintiff-Appellee wants the court to grant this petition because the court would want US authorities to catch the dirty dogs who sell the drugs to the dealers who make deals with the jet maintenance sailors to deliberately damage aircraft parts and install them for Vinton Cerf and Robert Kahn with DARPA and Aspen Systems, Inc.. It might be with the added enticement of my intellectual property essays to read and/or purchase.

The Defendant-Appellees are lying they never had anything to do with the Plaintiff-Appellee and didn't steal her philosophic-scientific essays. The baseless claim referring to "baseless" when the statute of limitations regarding the Plaintiff-Appellee's essays from 1980 would hold true 38 years later, so it's baseless, is what the Plaintiff-Appellee can understand for the law's existence, but where they are saying her claim is "fantastic"; she is "delusional" and needs to have "rationality" checked because of being by *in forma pauperis*, is by, as the Plaintiff-Appellee would like to point out, the Defendant-Appellees are nervous liars. The Defendant-Appellees are lying under oath.

Despite a 2005 spinal cord injury, the Plaintiff-Appellee is in excellent mental health. The Plaintiff-Appellee has since finished her bachelor's degree with a BFA and has graduated M.Ed. in Learning and Technology. The Plaintiff-Appellee is employable as a teacher. She will not fly apart. The Plaintiff-Appellee can deliver a cogent argument before a jury.

Defendant-Appellee Vinton Cerf is the head of computers in some research, but he and Defendant-Appellee Robert Kahn are the thieves of my essays. They are imposters using my material. The Plaintiff-Appellee has not lied under oath. The Defendant-Appellees have lied under oath. The

Plaintiff-Appellee wants the court to grant her petition to please order the Defendant-Appellees to give intellectual property essays back to the Plaintiff-Appellee because she is author of them. The Plaintiff-Appellee allegations are:

- The Defendant-Appellees are who stole her essays with the premeditated setup offer of a fake ride home.
- The Defendant-Appellees are lying under oath they have never associated with the Plaintiff-Appellee.
- The Defendant-Appellees are lying under oath they did not steal the Plaintiff-Appellee's essays, because the Plaintiff-Appellee was there being tricked and robbed.
- Defendant-Appellee Robert Kahn denied to the Plaintiff-Appellee he knew Defendant-Appellee Vinton Cerf, though the Plaintiff-Appellee saw them talking together.
- The UN is where the Plaintiff-Appellee believes Defendant-Appellee Vinton Cerf sells the stolen essays to UN prime ministers under his own name. This offends the Plaintiff-Appellee, as the essays are the Plaintiff-Appellee's material by authorship and the Plaintiff-Appellee lives below poverty level.
- The Defendant-Appellees are in perjury before the court they did not steal the Plaintiff-Appellee's material. The Defendant-Appellees did steal it in a setup as described by the Plaintiff-Appellee in her statement above.
- The Defendant-Appellees worked for DARPA and appear to have helped Aspen Systems, Inc. sneak onto aircraft carriers.

The Defendant-Appellees are people so jealous of my writing, they would rather pay an exorbitant bribe than the pittance in damages to Plaintiff-Appellee and/or give the essays back. The Plaintiff-Appellee does not care more about money in damages than her essays. The essays constituted a substantial portion of her livelihood.

The Defendant-Appellees are angry at being exposed, but everyone will know the Plaintiff-Appellee found out who they were, and it was common knowledge there, in Norfolk, VA, the Plaintiff-Appellee was robbed of essays. The Plaintiff-Appellee's writing is intellectual property and she has a right to defend it.

The "voice of God" material in the science/religion essay is the Plaintiff-Appellee's religious belief in God. It exercises the Plaintiff-Appellee's first amendment right to expound religious belief in God and her right to free speech. The Defendant-Appellees interfered with the writing taking place on the Plaintiff-Appellee's belief in God and the Defendant-Appellees know that. Now they are obstructing justice by lying they never did it.

If the Defendant-Appellees try to explain their slander about saving the scientific-religious writing from a 'bad' girl, they are characterless perjurists they are. The Plaintiff-Appellee was not a bad girl type. The Plaintiff-Appellee was a college student and new there. Defendant-Appellee Vinton Cerf is the one who carried out a lame kiss act for trickery. The solution is to catch the Defendant-Appellees in their perjurious lies. The Defendant-Appellees need to stop slandering the Plaintiff-Appellee. If Defendant-Appellees explain what kind of person they wish the court to believe the Plaintiff-Appellee was, it is an admission to their lie of having not known of the Plaintiff-Appellee. The Defendant-

Appellees did associate with the Plaintiff-Appellee on the pretense of a ride home offer, to rob her of the 'document' of essays the Defendant-Appellees are lying they did not steal.

The Plaintiff-Appellee's first amendment right to have religious-scientific essays returned should be examined by the court more thoroughly because the essays are intellectual property neither Defendant-Appellee authored. Intellectual property should not be time-barred. The Plaintiff-Appellee was writing about God they coveted. Stealing the Plaintiff-Appellee's work interferes with the Constitutional right to the first amendment of the free exercise of religion and of the right to free speech.

> Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances. *(First Amendment, Constitution of United States of America 1789 (rev. 1992))*

Defendant-Appellee Vinton Cerf has come a long, respectable way greatly thanks to the Plaintiff-Appellee. He is a computer scientist. The Defendant-Appellee does not see what is "grossly unfair" (Ibid., 2019) to the Defendant-Appellees, they so deserve to be exposed. Plaintiff-Appellee Susan Pattishall, on the other hand, does not deserve to be deprived of her intellectual property essays.

To sexists, Defendant-Appellees Cerf and Kahn, the essays are by a woman. Yet, the essays are the Defendant-Appellees' comprehension and stolen livings on the side because they sell the work high-priced. This is how grossly unfair it means to the Plaintiff-Appellee, living under poverty level, and it is because the essays are seriously intrinsic intellectual property. The Plaintiff-Appellee is an unemployed teacher who can explicate her essays the way they were meant to be expanded instead of the reckless way they are currently abused. The Plaintiff-Appellee is available to do this and lead us away from the wrong activities of these men. What was grossly unfair to them? The Plaintiff-Appellee would please like the court to understand she is the educated person the Defendant-Appellees have impersonated, insulted, and insinuated about by their psychosis of sexism and substance abuse. The Plaintiff-Appellee wishes the court would please see how grossly unfair it is to her.

How could the Plaintiff-Appellee's work have to be Defendant-Appellee Vinton Cerf's work or Defendant-Appellee Robert Kahn's work? Both people were interested in impersonating the career value of Plaintiff-Appellee's family and the Plaintiff-Appellee as an author. The Defendant-Appellee stole the Plaintiff-Appellee's family and academic life away by a deliberate destruction of her research thus future opportunity. Defendant-Appellee Vinton Cerf is being called a genius using the Plaintiff-Appellee's genius. The Plaintiff-Appellee was not in his place, somehow, as they claimed, for Defendant-Appellee Vinton Cerf was neither the sister of the Plaintiff-Appellee's brother nor the source of intrinsic creativity the Plaintiff-Appellee and her brother inherited from their father. The Defendant-Appellees were jealous.

The Defendant-Appellees' lawyers said the Defendant-Appellees did not have an association with the Plaintiff-Appellee and, therefore, did not steal anything, although they won their motion with a time-bar. Intellectual property should never be time-barred. Memories may fade, but intellectual property is still intellectual property; and what could the Plaintiff-Appellee's memories involved in writing her religious belief and scientific knowledge possibly have to do with either of the Defendant-

Appellees? The Defendant-Appellees were only extremely interested in modeling the Plaintiff-Appellee's talent and education on themselves and framing the Plaintiff-Appellee to falsely mean she was someone without any real education thence far. It is discouraging the unscrupulous Defendant-Appellees were employees of DARPA because DARPA is the agency to which the public submits innovation proposals. It is currently piecemeal, but information is leaking about their association with an author named Dan Brown who, yes, has a copy of the essays.

The Defendant-Appellees are lying under oath and their theft was deliberate, and the stolen material is the Plaintiff-Appellee's. The Defendant-Appellees distributed it to others and took the credit. The Plaintiff-Appellee knows it was a work that made them more effective than they were and one they did not own prior to stealing it from the Plaintiff-Appellee. Why can sexist The Defendant-Appellee Vinton Cerf take the credit for authorship of the Plaintiff-Appellee's intellectual property? Is this case only demonstrating the logic money is the judicial condescending to fraud and corruption, which is more important than the Plaintiff-Appellee's constitutional rights? Defendant-Appellee Vinton Cerf feels this is the case because he is wealthy and wants to flaunt it and rub it in.

The Plaintiff-Appellee believes the Defendant-Appellees helped spies John Anthony Walker and Jonathan Jay Pollard, among foreigners who have received her essays. Anne Pollard tells of receiving the Plaintiff-Appellee's 'document', or essays, as a trade for money, or twenty-five hundred dollars.. Technically, this is inadmissible 'grapevine's gossip' by Anne Pollard. She connected to me when I asked her after reading a recent article on the Pollard spy case in the online Huffington Post.

The friend or 'date' the to which the Plaintiff-Appellee refers has the name of "Ronald Morley" in common with the SEC offender Morley, but the Plaintiff-Appellee cannot be sure it is the same person. At the time, Ronald Morley was around 18 years old. This fact is not mentioned previously because the Plaintiff-Appellee is only just finding out things in current news herself. It is the same name and it might have been his misfortune he has had anything to do with the Defendant-Appellees. Possibly, he was who told them I was a writer and it might be trade-worthy material. Again, I was brand new there, just arriving that summer.

CONCLUSION

The Plaintiff-Appellee's essays should be returned to Plaintiff-Appellee Susan E. Pattishall because intellectual property should never be time-barred. It is a different type of property. The court has control over the power to establish what is considered Virginia's intellectual property of nuclear energy. This is scientific information in the Plaintiff-Appellee's essays not being handled safely or fairly by the Defendant-Appellees.

The Defendant-Appellees should be made to swear another oath on their version of the truth, because so far they have lied. Taking the Defendant-Appellees' word over the Plaintiff-Appellee's is ignoring their perjury and deferring US student advancement. It is not grossly unfair to the Defendant-Appellees to hand over a copy of the essays they stole. The current situation is too much ownership/authorship to them.

With respect to their early interests and knowledge, Defendant-Appellees Vinton G. Cerf and Robert E. Kahn have come an overly dignified way thanks to the Plaintiff-Appellee. The Defendant-

Appellee are basically computer buffs not philosophy buffs. The Plaintiff-Appellee objects it is "grossly unfair" to the Defendant-Appellees, they so deserve to be exposed.

The Plaintiff-Appellee, on the other hand, does not deserve to be deprived of her essays and the authorship. The Plaintiff-Appellee does not deserve Defendant-Appellee Vinton Cerf's slander and his lawyer's implied 'stigma' of being in forma pauperis. The essays are supporting the Defendant-Appellees' entire comprehension of gentility and extracurricular knowledge, making a living on the side because the Defendant-Appellees sell the work high-priced. This is how "grossly unfair" it means, and it is the Plaintiff-Appellee's intellectual property. Intellectual property is made of efficacy and personality. Intellectual property is intrinsic; and, therefore, intellectual property should not be time-barred..

The Plaintiff-Appellee is an educated teacher who can explicate her essays the way the essays were meant to be expanded, instead of the way the essays are currently abused by the Defendant-Appellees. The Plaintiff-Appellee is available to do this and lead students and researchers away from the wrong activities of the Defendant-Appellees, and where the work will have educational value, instead of 'oxygenating' drugged drunkards and selling US academic information to foreign and hostile foreign countries. The Plaintiff-Appellee is an author on educational topics. Currently, the essays are being exploited, extrapolated by what emphasizes fraud and slander.

The Plaintiff-Appellee believes the Defendant-Appellees sell her intellectual property today. The Defendant-Appellees accrued wealth and false prestige by selling the Plaintiff-Appellee's work as theirs. This would happen henceforth by the statute of limitations meaning because the Plaintiff-Appellee didn't find them within five years the Plaintiff-Appellee must believe Defendant-Appellee Vinton Cerf is allowed to say he authored her work.

A rule that just makes decisions easy is not fair or wise in this case. At least there should be an exception to it when treason was at hand and the traitors are identified. The Defendant-Appellees are traitors who should be questioned and/or prosecuted, and the property returned to the Plaintiff-Appellee, the author who feels she cannot participate in the treason or ever be assumed to have passed her work this way. The Plaintiff-Appellee feels the work, as such a work, is safest with her, the Plaintiff-Appellee, considering more people who will use it in animosity are reading it now. Because the value of the work cannot be denied, it is obscene the court wants society to believe it is the Defendant-Appellees' work and not whose work it truly is. If the court cannot give the work back to the Plaintiff-Appellee, she will publish a book against the Defendant-Appellees and a scandal will ensue.

The Plaintiff-Appellee became a hostage in her own country while being patriotic and writing for the common good. Perhaps a concise wording would be 'if a copy of the essays would be given back to the Plaintiff-Appellee, it would not be a big loss to either Defendant-Appellee Cerf or Defendant-Appellee Kahn'. Unless this is done, the Plaintiff-Appellee is a hostage in her own country and the Defendant-Appellees appear to be the rich notorious heroes only making themselves and their customers happy. The Plaintiff-Appellee wishes the court would please see how it is the Plaintiff-Appellee to whom it is grossly unfair. The Plaintiff-Appellee understands many people are being productive by her intellectual property and these people view it as an aid product as they purchased from the Defendant-Appellees. These are very unfair people who are making their livings while expecting the Plaintiff-Appellee to be their hostage victim and not caring, as many do say they knew the Plaintiff-Appellee was the actual author.

It seems obvious to the Plaintiff-Appellee, if even federal court justice Honorable Liam O'Grady owns a copy of the work he just became familiar with, instead of delivering justice, the case does feel hopeless. He admits this is true. The Plaintiff-Appellee does not think he would tell the truth if asked about this. The Plaintiff-Appellee asks the Supreme Court to consider her expertise in matters of learning and technology and her unique experience in studying star maps. She understands it might require more than the page allotment to explain her talent and expertise to win your conviction in her fortitude to push our boys and all engineers forward to better environs, but thinks she could argue it would indeed be for our purposes here, and feels she is better trained than either of the Defendant-Appellees to lead us.

In the opinion of the Plaintiff-Appellee, these people think against the grain of the protection of their own academic and creative works. Academics are involved in a common cause for identity in the creative market and should understand harboring someone's work would be the opposite of everything they have fought to engender since the Statute of Anne Copyright Act of 1710: "to empower Creators to determine their moral rights, usage permissions and to be paid a fair price for commercial use of their work". This is considered a watershed event in copyright history, the underpinnings of public copyright law. The US needs to think fair that it is 'technical' over too fresh thesis work, a work that has evidently raised a wide piracy and conspiracy. The very values writers aspire to for recognition of their work have been cast aside.

The essays should be returned to the Plaintiff-Appellee. The Plaintiff-Appellee demands the truth be told. The Defendant-Appellees' perjurious lies should be exposed and the Defendant-Appellees need to stop slandering the Plaintiff-Appellee.

The pro se Plaintiff-Appellee wishes the court would please see how grossly unfair it would be to the Plaintiff-Appellee to award the Defendant-Appellees her intellectual property instead of her.

The Virginia statute of limitations needs an update to preserve intellectual property. This would be worthy, noble, and compelling cause and referendum.

The Plaintiff-Appellee is not against remuneration but is mainly interested in the return of her work over and above the monetary claim for damages set at five million dollars. Morally, she has done her patriotic duty to alert the justice system to the fact the Defendant-Appellees are at work against the grain of smooth aircraft operations and certainly against patriotism despite their assistance to a handful of people who are their US customers, writers, and gofers. Globally, yes, the piracy is growing. Unfortunately, unless help is given to the Plaintiff-Appellee, it is also with the harmful effect the US is lagging.

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan E. Pattishall