


19-5368

No. _____

ORIGINAL

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Anna Maria Agolli — PETITIONER
(Your Name)



vs.
DC Government, et al. — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

District of Columbia Court of Appeals
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Anna Maria Agolli
(Your Name)

4201 Butterworth Pl. NW, #423
(Address)

Washington DC 20016
(City, State, Zip Code)

202 681 8576
(Phone Number)

10

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

Should Courts allow qualified immunity to protect governments and their employees in spite of evidence only because it is the first of such violations? Do governments and their employees really need the warning of a previous case to know the difference between right/responsibility and wrong/misconduct?

Should Courts allow qualified immunity to protect governments and their employees in spite of evidence against habeas corpus or false imprisonment or other obvious crimes? Should government employees and officials be able to just rely on qualified immunity even though they should be able to recognize that their actions or the directives they receive are plainly criminal?

Should Courts allow qualified immunity to protect governments and their employees rather than looking at criminal issues per se, such as a kidnapping done by a non-government official or employee. Should statutes of limitations and deadlines and other technicalities that apply to governments and to the purpose of protecting governments and their employees be applied when the conduct of the government employee or official was actually criminal and wouldn't be applicable, for instance, the statute of limitations and technical requirements on kidnapping is not the same as the statute of limitations? And should the Courts allow government officials' and employees' dragging their feet and the eventual court cases dismissing such cases because of qualified immunity or any other reason or technicality be used to allow a statute of limitations for a felony such as kidnapping or false imprisonment and conspiracy of such to be regarded as elapsed because of the interference with dereliction, dragging feet, inappropriate or lack of action, etc., and for the purpose of blocking that criminal action is taken appropriately?

Should Courts allow qualified immunity to protect governments and their employees rather than apply a higher standard to such as government officials and employees?

Should the U. S. Supreme Court overturn precedents that have favored qualified immunity to protect governments and their employees even in spite of evidence, without doing the same for the persons whose rights were violated by government officials and/or employees?

Sure, MPD wanted to accommodate the interests of the subjects of the federal complaint against Bishop Loverde, et al., however should the Courts accommodate the abuse of discretion by government officials and employees, just because the abuse of discretion was carried out by officers and the like, if such abuse of discretion has nothing to do with carrying out the intent of the law but rather accommodation of certain powerful groups who have the police in their pocket? Should the U. S. Supreme Court not overturn abuse of discretion/qualified immunity in all cases when presented to it to end abuse of discretion and violation of citizens' rights, after all, isn't that the true intent of having a government rather than protecting priests from criminal consequences or protecting the interests of powerful entities from such nuisances as some citizen they thought could be dispensed with by calling in markers at the government? Wouldn't it be the U. S. Supreme Court to put an end to all such corruption?

Shouldn't the U. S. Supreme Court revisit Immunity Defense, Qualified-immunity, and all laws that grant immunity to governments and/or their employees that are otherwise written to keep governments and their employees from being sued or suffering the consequences of their actions. Should it be necessary to require that governments and their employees are warned by virtue of a previous action wherein the plaintiff had his rights violated or suffered criminal misconduct, etc., to give that government and its employees a second chance at violating another citizen's Constitutional rights, or do other harm? Shouldn't such governments and their employees be sufficiently qualified to do their work and educated and in possession of personal integrity that they can be expected to be held to a higher standard or suffer criminal consequences and civil action judgments to correct wrongs, isn't that warning too, of the kind that won't be taken for granted by those enjoying the license of immunity?

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:

PLEASE SEE ATTACHED SHEETS
WITH LIST OF PARTIES

LIST OF PARTIES AND COUNSEL

Plaintiff-Appellant: Anna Maria Agolli, Pro Se

Defendants for 17-CV-1064/16-008668:

District of Columbia Government

Serving:

Mayor of the District of Columbia, 441 Fourth Street, NW, Suite 6305S
Washington, DC 20001

and

Attorney General for the District of Columbia
441 Fourth Street, NW, Suite 630S, Washington, DC 20001

Angela Washington, MBA, MSM, Privacy Officer, Information & Privacy Office
Executive Office of the Fire Chief,
2000 14th Street, NW, #500, Washington, DC 20009
Phone: 202 637 3397/eFax: 202 673 2370, Angela.Washington@dc.gov

Tina L. Curtis, Esq., CIPP, Director/District-Wide Privacy & Security Official
Office of Healthcare Privacy and Confidentiality
Office of the Attorney General for DC
441 4th Street, NW #1100S, Washington, DC 20001
tina.curtis@dc.gov, 202 442 9373 phone/cell 202 664 0196

c/o Anita Massengale, RN, BA, JD, Project Director
2029 K Street NW, # 700, Washington DC 20006
Tel. 202-496-6540, massengalea@delmarvafoundation.org
formerly, Clinical Quality Program Manager,
District of Columbia Fire and EMS
1923 Vermont Ave., NW, Washington D.C. 20001

c/o Mr. Tolland Butler (EMT-B) 1631 of Primary Member 108225,
Event No. F130042064 of 4/1/13
Gregory M. Dean, Fire and EMS Chief
Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department
2000 14th Street, NW, #500, Washington, DC 20009
Phone 202 673 3320, Fax 202 462 0807

Director and/or Chief, Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department
2000 14th Street, NW, #500, Washington, DC 20009

“Call taker position 135, unified communications computer aided dispatch database server, dispatcher position 122, \$ ambulance 25, public safety communications computer aided dispatch mobile 2 (server), on April 1 2013 at 2:14:11 Term 135 Operator 7951 for Event Number F130042064”

c/o Karima Holmes, Director and Privacy Officer
Office of Unified Communications
2720 Martin Luther King, Jr. Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20032
Phone 202 730 0524, Fax 202 730 0514, director.ouc@dc.gov

Karima Holmes, Director and Privacy Officer,
Office of Unified Communications
2720 Martin Luther King, Jr. Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20032
Phone 202 730 0524, Fax 202 730 0514, director.ouc@dc.gov

Ms. Tammie Creamer, FOIA Ofcr for OUC & OUC
Transcription Ofc, Ofc of Unified Communications
2720 Martin Luther King, Jr. Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20032

Steve Williams, Office of Unified Communications
2720 Martin Luther King, Jr. Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20032

Adrianne Day, Acting General Counsel, Office of Unified Communications
2720 Martin Luther King, Jr. Avenue SE
Washington, DC 20032, adrianne.day2@dc.gov

Chief of Police and any and all persons answerable and responsible for such items as is alleged in this complaint in all its ramifications, any and all persons involved in any and all events described in this complaint and that would be learned upon fact finding via testimony, subpoena, etc.

Metropolitan Police Department, 300 Indiana Avenue, NW, Rm 5059
Washington, DC 20001, Phone 202 727 9099, Fax 202 727 4106, mpdd@dc.gov

Lt. Michelle.Ridlehoover, Patrol Division, PSA102
Metropolitan Police Department, First District
101 M Street SW, Washington, DC 20024
Main 202 698 0555, Direct dial 202 729 2196, michelle.ridlehoover@dc.gov

Sgt. Laswaun Washington, Patrol Division PSA 703 Seventh District, MPD
2455 Alabama Avenue, SE, Washington, DC 20020
Main 202 698 1500, Direct dial 202 698 1462, laswaun.washington@dc.gov

Officer Tonia Jones, Medical Services Division Police and Fire Clinic, MPD
920 Varnum Street NE, Washington, DC 20017
Main 202 269 7731, Direct Dial: 202 854 7112
c/o 801 Shepherd Street, NW, Washington, DC 20011

Lt. John Alter, Youth Division, MPD
5002 Hayes Street NE, Washington , DC 20019
Main 202 576 3408, Direct dial 202 576 6285

c/o General Counsel, 300 Indiana Avenue NW #4115,
Washington, DC 20001, 727 4129/Fax 727 3308

Melissa C. Tucker, Associate Director,
Mayor's Office of Legal Counsel (MOLC)
1350 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Suite 407, Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 7278196/(202) 6897466 (cell),
Melissa.Tucker@dc.gov, www.mayor.dc.gov

✓

Bijan Hughes, Charlotte E. Ray Fellow, Mayor's Office of Legal Counsel
Executive Office of Mayor Muriel E. Bowser
1350 Pennsylvania Ave NW, Suite 407, Washington, DC 20001
202-727-8812, bijan.hughes@dc.gov, www.mayor.dc.gov

John Marsh, Legal Fellow, Mayor's Office of Legal Counsel (MOLC)
1350 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Suite 407, Washington, D.C. 20004
John.Marsh@dc.gov, www.mayor.dc.gov

Defendants for 17-CV-1065/16-009224:

District of Columbia Government

Serving:

Mayor of the District of Columbia, 441 Fourth Street, NW, Suite 6305S
Washington, DC 20001

and

Attorney General for the District of Columbia
441 Fourth Street, NW, Suite 630S, Washington, DC 20001

Angela Washington, MBA, MSM,
Privacy Officer, Information and Privacy Office
Executive Office of the Fire Chief
2000 14th Street, NW, #500, Washington, DC 20009
Phone: 202 637 3397/eFax: 202 673 2370, Angela.Washington@dc.com

Tina L. Curtis, Esq., CIPP, Director/District-Wide Privacy & Security Official
Office of Healthcare Privacy and Confidentiality
Office of the Attorney General for DC
441 4th Street, NW #1100S, Washington, DC 20001
tina.curtis@dc.gov, 202 442 9373 phone/cell 202 664 0196

c/o Anita Massengale, RN, BA, JD, Project Director
2029 K Street NW, # 700, Washington DC 20006
Tel. 202-496-6540, massengalea@delmarvafoundation.org
formerly, Clinical Quality Program Manager, District of Columbia Fire and EMS
1923 Vermont Ave., NW, Washington D.C. 20001

Mr. Tolland Butler (EMT-B) 1631 of Primary Member 108225,
Event No. F130042064 of 4/1/13
c/o Gregory M. Dean, Fire and EMS Chief
Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department
2000 14th Street, NW, #500, Washington, DC 20009
Phone 202 673 3320, Fax 202 462 0807

Director and/or Chief
Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department
2000 14th Street, NW, #500, Washington, DC 20009

“Call taker position 135, unified communications computer aided dispatch

✓/B

database server, dispatcher paosision 122, \$ ambulance 25, public safety communications computer aided dispatch mobile 2 (server), on April 1 2013 at 2:14:11 Term 135 Operator 7951 for Event Number F130042064"

c/o Karima Holmes, Director and Privacy Officer,
Office of Unified Communications
2720 Martin Luther King, Jr. Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20032
Phone 202 730 0524, Fax 202 730 0514, director.ouc@dc.gov

Karima Holmes, Director and Privacy Officer
Office of Unified Communications
2720 Martin Luther King, Jr. Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20032
Phone 202 730 0524, Fax 202 730 0514, director.ouc@dc.gov

Ms. Tammie Creamer, FOIA Ofcr for OUC & OUC
Transcription Ofc, Ofc of Unified Communications
2720 Martin Luther King, Jr. Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20032

Steve Williams, Office of Unified Communications
2720 Martin Luther King, Jr. Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20032

Adrianne Day, Acting General Counsel, Office of Unified Communications
2720 Martin Luther King, Jr. Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20032
adrianne.day2@dc.gov

Chief of Police and any and all persons answerable and responsible for such items as is alleged in this complaint in all its ramifications, any and all persons involved in any and all events described in this complaint and that would be learned upon fact finding via testimony, subpoena, etc.

Metropolitan Police Department, 300 Indiana Avenue, NW, Rm 5059
Washington, DC 20001
Phone 202 727 9099, Fax 202 727 4106, mpdd@dc.gov

Lt. Michelle.Ridlehoover, Patrol Division, PSA102,
Metropolitan Police Department, First District
101 M Street SW, Washington, DC 20024
Main 202 698 0555, Direct dial 202 729 2196, michelle.ridlehoover@dc.gov

Sgt. Laswaun Washington, Patrol Division PSA 703 Seventh District, MPD
2455 Alabama Avenue, SE, Washington, DC 20020
Main 202 698 1500, Direct dial 202 698 1462, laswaun.washington@dc.gov

Officer Tonia Jones, Medical Services Division, Police and Fire Clinic, MPD
920 Varnum Street NE, Washington, DC 20017
Main 202 269 7731, Direct Dial: 202 854 7112
801 Shepherd Street, NW, Washington, DC 20011

Lt. John Alter, Youth Division, MPD
5002 Hayes Street NE, Washington , DC 20019
Main 202 576 3408, Direct dial 202 576 6285

c/o General Counsel, 300 Indiana Avenue NW #4115
Washington, DC 20001, 727 4129/Fax 727 3308

Melissa C. Tucker, Associate Director
Mayor's Office of Legal Counsel (MOLC)
1350 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Suite 407, Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 7278196/(202) 6897466 (cell),
Melissa.Tucker@dc.gov, www.mayor.dc.gov

Bijan Hughes, Charlotte E. Ray Fellow, Mayor's Office of Legal Counsel
Executive Office of Mayor Muriel E. Bowser
1350 Pennsylvania Ave NW, Suite 407, Washington, DC 20001
202-727-8812, bijan.hughes@dc.gov, www.mayor.dc.gov

John Marsh, Legal Fellow, Mayor's Office of Legal Counsel (MOLC)
1350 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Suite 407, Washington, D.C. 20004
John.Marsh@dc.gov, www.mayor.dc.gov

Defendants for 17-CV-1239/17-003059:

District of Columbia Government

Serving:

Mayor of the District of Columbia
441 Fourth Street, NW, Suite 6305S, Washington, DC 20001
and
Attorney General for the District of Columbia
441 Fourth Street, NW, Suite 630S, Washington, DC 20001

Angela Washington, MBA, MSM
Privacy Officer, Information and Privacy Office
Executive Office of the Fire Chief
2000 14th Street, NW, #500, Washington, DC 20009
Phone: 202 637 3397/eFax: 202 673 2370, Angela.Washington@dc.com

Tina L. Curtis, Esq., CIPP, Director/District-Wide Privacy & Security Official
Office of Healthcare Privacy and Confidentiality
Office of the Attorney General for DC
441 4th Street, NW #1100S, Washington, DC 20001
tina.curtis@dc.gov, 202 442 9373 phone/cell 202 664 0196

c/o Anita Massengale, RN, BA, JD, Project Director
2029 K Street NW, # 700, Washington DC 20006
Tel. 202-496-6540, massengalea@delmarvafoundation.org
formerly, Clinical Quality Program Manager, District of Columbia Fire and EMS
1923 Vermont Ave., NW, Washington D.C. 20001

Mr. Tolland Butler (EMT-B) 1631 of Primary
Member 108225, Event No. F130042064 of 4/1/13
c/o Gregory M. Dean, Fire and EMS Chief
Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department

2000 14th Street, NW, #500, Washington, DC 20009
Phone 202 673 3320, Fax 202 462 0807

Director and/or Chief, Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department
2000 14th Street, NW, #500, Washington, DC 20009

“Call taker position 135, unified communications computer aided dispatch database server, dispatcher position 122, \$ ambulance 25, public safety communications computer aided dispatch mobile 2 (server), on April 1 2013 at 2:14:11 Term 135 Operator 7951 for Event Number F130042064”

c/o Karima Holmes, Director and Privacy Officer
Office of Unified Communications
2720 Martin Luther King, Jr. Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20032
Phone 202 730 0524, Fax 202 730 0514, director.ouc@dc.gov

Karima Holmes, Director and Privacy Officer
Office of Unified Communications
2720 Martin Luther King, Jr. Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20032
Phone 202 730 0524, Fax 202 730 0514, director.ouc@dc.gov

Ms. Tammie Creamer, FOIA Ofc for OUC & OUC
Transcription Ofc, Ofc of Unified Communications
2720 Martin Luther King, Jr. Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20032

Steve Williams, Office of Unified Communications
2720 Martin Luther King, Jr. Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20032

Adrianne Day, Acting General Counsel, Office of Unified Communications
2720 Martin Luther King, Jr. Avenue SE
Washington, DC 20032, adrianne.day2@dc.gov

Chief of Police and any and all persons answerable and responsible for such items as is alleged in this complaint in all its ramifications, any and all persons involved in any and all events described in this complaint and that would be learned upon fact finding via testimony, subpoena, etc.

Metropolitan Police Department, 300 Indiana Avenue, NW, Rm 5059
Washington, DC 20001
Phone 202 727 9099, Fax 202 727 4106, mpdd@dc.gov

Lt. Michelle.Ridlehoover, Patrol Division, PSA102
Metropolitan Police Department, First District
101 M Street SW, Washington, DC 20024
Main 202 698 0555, Direct dial 202 729 2196, michelle.ridlehoover@dc.gov

Sgt. Laswaun Washington, Patrol Division PSA 703 Seventh District, MPD
2455 Alabama Avenue, SE, Washington, DC 20020
Main 202 698 1500, Direct dial 202 698 1462, laswaun.washington@dc.gov

Officer Tonia Jones, Medical Services Division, Police and Fire Clinic, MPD

1X

920 Varnum Street NE, Washington, DC 20017
Main 202 269 7731, Direct Dial: 202 854 7112
c/o 801 Shepherd Street, NW, Washington, DC 20011

Lt. John Alter, Youth Division, MPD
5002 Hayes Street NE, Washington , DC 20019
Main 202 576 3408, Direct dial 202 576 6285
c/o General Counsel, 300 Indiana Avenue NW #4115
Washington, DC 20001, 727 4129/Fax 727 3308

Melissa C. Tucker, Associate Director,
Mayor's Office of Legal Counsel (MOLC)
1350 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Suite 407, Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 7278196/(202) 6897466 (cell)
Melissa.Tucker@dc.gov, www.mayor.dc.gov

Bijan Hughes, Charlotte E. Ray Fellow, Mayor's Office of Legal Counsel
Executive Office of Mayor Muriel E. Bowser
1350 Pennsylvania Ave NW, Suite 407, Washington, DC 20001
202-727-8812, bijan.hughes@dc.gov, www.mayor.dc.gov

John Marsh, Legal Fellow, Mayor's Office of Legal Counsel (MOLC)
1350 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Suite 407, Washington, D.C. 20004
John.Marsh@dc.gov, www.mayor.dc.gov

Defendants-Respondents' Counsel:

Philip A. Medley, Esq., Assistant Attorney General
441 Fourth Street NW, #630 South, Washington, DC 20001
202 724 6626/ 202 741 5920 Fax, philip.medley@dc.gov

Carl J. Schifferle, Assistant Attorney General, Bar Number 463491
Lori AliKhan, Solicitor General
Office of Solicitor General, Office of Attorney General
441 4th Street, NW #630 So, Washington DC 20001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	4-10
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	11- 17
CONCLUSION.....	18

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX IS AT THE END OF THE DOCUMENT WITH ALL EXHIBITS AS INSTRUCTED

APPENDIX A	December 14 2018 District of Columbia Court of Appeals final judgment
APPENDIX B	August 29 2017 Order Granting Defendants' Motions to Dismiss 17-8668 and 9224 District of Columbia Superior Court
APPENDIX C	October 10 2017 Order Granting Defendants' Motion to Dismiss 17-3059 District of Columbia Superior Court
APPENDIX D	YouTube uploads are same contents provided to the District of Columbia Court of Appeals in my September 17 2018 and November 26 2018 filings, plus more as described on the continuation sheets. Where available, quick transcriptions of some of the YouTube uploads are available and these are named Appendix D with identifying information
APPENDIX E	Office of Police Complaints exhibits (YouTube uploads, the rest is on paper), etc., as described on the continuation sheets Where available, quick transcriptions of some of the YouTube uploads are available and these are named Appendix E with identifying information
APPENDIX F	Other appendices and exhibits as described on the continuation sheets
APPENDIX G	Contact from FEMS after HHS made them end their stonewalling. Where available, quick transcription of some of the YouTube uploads are available and these are named Appendix G with identifying information Continued at the back with all exhibits, as instructed.

*Transcriptions are not formal or professionally done but are a quick synopsis or paraphrased quickly rather than entirely verbatim but not lacking the recount that happens to be available in some cases because I submitted the information to some other agency and so am re-using them here. The YouTube uploads cannot be scanned or read quickly, but they're verbatim proof.

INDEX TO APPENDICES CONTINUED

I understand from speaking with USSC that YouTube urls are permissible as long as the information is submitted on paper, although transcripts were suggested also. I do not have professional transcriptions but I have provided some quick transcriptions of some recordings that I submitted to previous jurisdictions and have cut and pasted them here although unfortunately I don't have one for each recording. I received help in converting the audios for YouTube upload and had to work rather quickly to provide URLs to go with each recording title for each batch of uploads and in the event I overlooked to enter the URLs for each recording or mistyped any, you can find them on my YouTube site at the following as they are entitled the same or very similarly to the ones listed in this appendix:

<https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCgYdULoJRv9ZIcpKNCJklFQ>

There are other recordings uploaded that are not directly related to this filing, but the ones that are are named and have a url. The recordings are being provided to insure that those who access this information realize that this is what actually happened, what actually was said and how it sounded when it was said. The quick transcription that I provide for some of the recordings is to temporarily provide quick information in case someone has some persistent problem with the URLs or has no easy access to internet or to assist in recalling the contents of that particular recording while making an assessment. Most people who will access this document will have access to internet.

APPENDIX D Consists of the same contents provided to the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, especially in my September 17 2018 and November 26 2018 filings that had a CD with recordings on it that the DCCA accepted, the D. C. Superior Court did not accept CDs but only paper. I also filed with the filings some additional exhibits. To the exclusion of nothing else I've filed regarding this matter, including in the 17-cv-96, etc. cases that cover the beginning of this situation, the entire record should be accessed, but I have included exhibits that seem more pivotal, although less pivotal exhibits are also important for background support of the truth.

I list the exhibits here that seem more pertinent in making a case for the Questions Presented in this filing so they don't just regard these cases in particular but also past experiences and proofs that I never brought to Court. Not everyone winds up in court when there is an injustice, even the more alarming ones. I can't use an ambulance anymore, I am therefore endangered, so I brought this to Court. But before it got to the point that it is now, I was endangered too because I suffered crime and threat but the MPD would not act, instead they acted to silence me while I was having stroke-like symptoms. I include recordings so that argument or bad testimony will not take away from the importance of the issues regarding the eradication of corruption. Since the USSC is okay with URLs for recordings and has access to the uploads of the previous jurisdictions as well, it can get an immediate alarm as regards the situation. The actual OUC April 1 2013 recording of the Alert1 call for an ambulance that proves major duplicity and collusion and false documentation by OUC, FEMS, et al., or the tampered FOIA released MPD audio and my own recording of the same conversation about arresting the EMT, etc., are the most crucial but there is no lack of holes or lying elsewhere.

September 17 2018 filing exhibits

Contents of the 17-cv-96 opening brief exhibit CD: I asked for March 29 2013 and April 1 2013 OUC audios and background event chronologies in May 2015 and in October 2016 I asked (and obtained

partially and with difficulty) the same March 29 and April 1 2013 information PLUS all calls with FEMS, OUC, MPD from April 1 2013 to May 31 2013. I do not duplicate information for the March 29 and April 1 2013 calls because they were released again and there is no difference between the May 2015 release and the February 2017 release except that the latter are a .wav formatted file. The only reason I asked for the March 29 2013 recording and accompanying information was because the April 1 2013 response to similar stroke-like symptoms was handled like an aberration while the March 29 2013 was handled in a manner one might normally expect, and so I requested it to be able to make a comparison. But although I don't bother to do more than just list the April 1 and March 29 2013 requests here given the a fuller information is provided under the November 2018 filing, I do list here the paper exhibits that I included in the September 17 2018 filing with the D. C. Court of Appeals.

I re-requested the March 29 2013 and April 1 2013 again in October 2015 because of the following inconsistencies, both times they were released, the actual recordings and chronos were the same, although they did put them on CD and formatted them as .wav files:

*Creamer decided I would not get CDs but only emailed, that was her decision although the just about everybody will refer to the release as a CD. I didn't want to have a release that turned out not to be the norm and then got questioned as to authenticity.

*The files I was sent were .wma, not .wav, although I was told originally .wav.

*There was a problem with the site (See Exhibit 1a-e 16-8668 and 16-9224 complaints, originally I only requested April 1 2013 information but then added the March 29 2013) when I attempted to do the request back in April 2015 online and Creamer said she would do it for me since the site was acting up instructing to contact system administrator because the site cannot perform the function, and she said that I would get a confirmation, but I didn't. I followed up on that by email without response. And when the request was completed, Creamer then asked suddenly if I had ever done the request online when she had originally told me she would do it because of the site not working properly. This was yet another reason why I re-requested the March 29 and April 1 2013 chronos and audios, because of these inconsistencies.

*If you spoke to two people you might get two different answers and so since Tammie Creamer went from being a supervisor to not a supervisor but just chipping in her help, it seemed a good idea to re-request just to see if I got the same thing or something that was more official looking and all more consistent. You will note, that Creamer who was just chipping in April 2015 was still "chipping in" in 2016, and she is the one who sent the February 4 2016 Fedex package with the releases. And the March 16 2016 FOIA response has Tammie Creamer cc'd as a FOIA Officer (this is in the OUC release on the CD and also on the original complaints 16-8668 and 16-9224). It was convenient for Tammie Creamer to suddenly become just a chipper-inner when they wanted to withhold the April 1 2013 audio.

*I called Creamer upon her request on May 18 2015, Creamer realized that I had noticed the contradiction that I was released the chron because my name wasn't on it but not the audio, and also because my name was not on it. OUC realizes that if they had not released the April 1 2013 chron, they could have denied me the audio also. So Creamer recalls her message. The only message she had a reason to recall was the one with the first partial release of both chronos given this contradiction, although there's a typo in the recall in that she recalls an email I sent. I had NO intention of returning anything to her, my life depended upon my getting this information. So I just pointed out that she couldn't recall the email she was recalling. Creamer never admits that she even tried to recall anything or explain what she wanted by her recall. That recall was a sleazy thing to do anyway, and they released the April 1 2013 audio after I told Creamer I had my own recording, whatever procedural hoops they had me jump through to cover up that sleaze.

*When they finally released both chronos and audios, Creamer asked if I had ever entered this online when she said she would do that for me because the site was malfunctioning and she said she would do

that, plus I followed up on that with her without ever getting a response until she asked if I ever managed it myself. So, was it necessary to have been done, or wasn't it? Did I need an online record of it or not? Of course, I re-requested that release. I safely had what they released, and if they re-released the identical thing, I had double proof. Hopefully, they would do a better job, they would release a CD and a signed letter more consistently presented. If this had happened to any other reasonable person, they might have wanted to re-do it, perhaps with different people, which might not be an option, because Tammie Creamer, who was just pitching in, was still there.

Again, please see the October 2 2017 Opening Brief for 17-cv-96, etc., and the D. C. Court of Appeals and the D. C. Superior Court, as well as the original D. C. Superior Court and D. C. Court of Appeals records for the docket numbers for this filing. I filed the audios that were released under FOIA and those that were requested and not released with a CD, which they accepted and should be on file. But the same and more are uploaded to YouTube here, and some I even provide a quick transcription. I would use the transcriptions more as a note to recall which was about what given there are so many and my recordings from that period are named as meaningless consecutive numbers from the device I used.

20180917 FEMS DCCA

- Ex 12 Holman quest Anna M. Agolli April 1 Definitions
- Exhibit 1 Aug 29 2017 Kravitz dismiss
- Exhibit 2 Dismissal for 17-3059
- Exhibit 3 oberly article
- Exhibit 4 Alert 1 redacted
- Exhibit 5 1b-Event_Chronology FOIA AGOLLI
- Exhibit 5 and 6 20160203 20150526 Letter
- Exhibit 6 1a-Event_Chronology FOIA AGOLLI .2
- Exhibit 10 January 24 2014 ePCR
- Exhibit 11 Event_Chronology FOIA 1725 RHODE ISLAND AVE NW 1-24-14.pdf
- Exhibit 13 Motion filed October 2017 that was technically
- Exhibit 14 2 _Father, Forgive them..._ (febfor1.htm)
- Exhibit 15 Ex 3 _Father, Forgive them..._ (febfor2.htm)

November 26 2018 filing exhibits

<https://youtu.be/dsXf61yEOJc>

1. FOIA Agolli 3304 6th St SE 3-29-13 C117 0159

This is a call for stroke-like symptoms that I made myself a few days before dialing 911 directly and the handling for this call was normal, very similar symptoms but entirely different handling when there isn't someone behind the scenes is not controlling what the call taker and EMT handle.

<https://youtu.be/6MHk7wWxSbU>

802_0965 911 March 29 2013 UMC

March 29 2013 159a This is my recording of the call to 911 with fleeting paralysis. This matches the OUC's release of the same conversation, the FOIA releases in May 2015 and February 3 2016.

https://youtu.be/zi48JXYk_o8

-Exhibit 7, 1. FOIA Agolli 3304 6th St SE 4-1-13 C135 0214 or

1. FOIA Agolli 3304 6th St SE 4-1-13 C135 0214

My recording 802_0974 April 1 2013 208a seems to correspond to FOIA release more than the chronology. My call to Alert1 is one-sided while the FOIA release is the conversation with OUC and Alert1, and while my recording proves that I reported stroke-like symptoms, the FOIA release of the same conversation show that Alert1 reported stroke-like symptoms that I reported to Alert1, and not what the chronology (supposedly documented by the call taker) or ePCR (documented by Tolland Butler) document. The May 2015 and February 2016 releases are identical to each other BUT are not recognizably similar let alone identical to the chronology and ePCR, although before the EMT ever arrived at my residence, the chron and ePCR were both identically falsely documented.

(You will note that on the audio Alert1's Kristen DOES mention vision and leg numbness, nothing about man down and walking, standing, etc., or anything as specified in the chron and ePCR. Kristen couldn't see me, all she could do was speak to me and tell dispatch what I said. Dispatch should have been able only to document what Kristen said. When you listen to my recording, there are no histrionics about my whereabouts and what I'm doing, which one can read on the chron and sounds even stalkish. The Alert1 system was a speaker system. The chron doesn't reflect what is actually said in this conversation between Kristen and dispatch. Dispatch asked if I was awake, breathing, completely alert, and whether I was lying down or sitting up. Kristen answered that I didn't say. Dispatch said ambulance was out and to tell me not to eat or drink and to rest in a comfortable position. Kristen requests no UMC and dispatch said they couldn't guarantee, can only do what's available. Nothing is said about whether I'm standing or walking or doing whatever they list in the chron that is documented in the chron, there's no "man down" mentioned, Kristen does not inquire about my whereabouts as though I were lost like it seems to be an issue on the chron, the chron seems to have been taken down in hysterics while the situation at my house was quite calm. Nor is hysteria and histrionics about my whereabouts apparent in the audio, and whether I'm standing or walking or man down is also not mentioned on the FOIA released audio, only on the chron and the ePCR. Kristen answered the questions of the dispatch with she didn't know. Both the Call taker and the EMT were either schizophrenically and psychically synced or they were instructed to document mental issues regardless of the reality. The EMT walked in acknowledging stroke-like symptoms and responded, but not really as though he knew something different had to happen which he had no way of knowing unless someone told him to document as he did BEFORE ever seeing me. His impression is based on the false documentation that occurred prior to arriving to my residence, not what he saw when he arrived at my house.

This is the call in question for this entire situation where I had Alert1 call on my behalf because I wanted them to take me NOT to UMC but to GW or somewhere where they have certification for strokes and I also explained this to the EMT who listened carefully, said yeah but not really, and took me to UMC without mentioning that that's where we were going notwithstanding I just said not to take me there. This phone call from OUC flies in the face of the call taker's documentation and the EMT's documentation of the situation because the Alert1 operator reported stroke-like symptoms, not what the call taker and EMT documented at all, and this was done prior to arriving at my residence where the EMT's "impression" was believed even though it occurred prior to his arrival, even though FEMS had access to the OUC audio on this – Massengale ordered it immediately upon speaking to me for the first time. My own recording of the conversation also rebuts the EMT and the call taker's false documentation, although the OUC's own recording rebuts the EMT and call taker's false documentation completely. Why a call taker would document something other than what they were told speaks volumes that an important superior took control of the situation and made self-serving use of it.

<https://youtu.be/Fp5q9EGZ-GU>

802_0974 Alert 1

207A April 1 2013, my recording of my conversation with Alert1/Kristen while she was speaking to

OUC also.

MISSING - NOT RELEASED AT ALL:

<https://youtu.be/0Zv-Xt803kg>

802_0995 Call to 311 1023p April 9 2013, Ms. Marshall answered and transferred me to 911, operator? got cut off before she gave me her ID. Redialed 311 spoke to Rodney THESE TWO CALLS TO 311 WERE NOT RELEASED PER THE FOIA AND THEY WERE MADE BY MY LANDLINE AT HOME SO I AM ASSUMING THEY SEARCHED VIA THAT HOME NUMBER, WHICH I GAVE TO DC FOIA WHEN I MADE THAT REQUEST.

MISSING – NOT RELEASED AT ALL

<https://youtu.be/KWnPk8jbkuk>

802_1055 EMS Professional Responsibility

(See attached exhibit for available transcript, Appendix D – Transcript 20130501)

<https://youtu.be/Zi6labk6APQ>

1. 3304 6th St SE 5-2-13 C109 1037

<https://youtu.be/NZBH6ZahJ4U>

802_1057 911 Missy Smith May 2 2013, OUC release matches this.

(See attached exhibit for available transcript, Appendix D – Transcript 20130501)

<https://youtu.be/3FzmdzO2X6E>

1. 3304 6th St SE 5-2-13 C123 transfer to ELO 2000

This is the call to MPD regarding the EMT Tolland Butler (I didn't yet realize that the falsified documentation started with the call taker, the EMT followed suit prior to ever arriving to my residence) arrested for kidnapping. I had called for stroke-like symptoms and asked to be taken elsewhere than UMC with clear explanation, and Butler didn't tell me I was being taken to UMC anyway. I would not have gotten on the ambulance if I had known. OUC kept transferring me to FEMS, eventually the MPD told me that FEMS had to determine that the EMT had not followed protocol (which ultimately he hadn't followed proper protocol but an agenda) and FEMS had to call and have him arrested. The person at FEMS, Rogers, I spoke to made ridiculous self-serving comments to protect their own.

<https://youtu.be/VB7Hr4GK7ZU>

802_1060 911 arrest Butler EMS

(See attached exhibit for available transcript, Appendix D – Transcript 20130502 2000)

<https://youtu.be/ZaRDvr2wQwU>

2. 3304 6th St SE 5-2-13 C133 transfer to ELO 2013

I was transferred to a Sgt. Faunce. My recording 802_1061 May 2 2013 operator 8041 recording matches this except for when I'm on hold, there's silence on mine and repetition on theirs, which repetition may be just the way it works. It didn't change the content at all although it did show the attitude that is related when transferring a call.)

<https://youtu.be/S7L4JZUQmj4>

802_1061 911 arrest Butler EMS

(See attached exhibit for available transcript, Appendix D – Transcript 20130502 2013)

THIS IS THE TAMPERED RELEASE

<https://youtu.be/pmeSnKIQR4M> or <https://youtu.be/9nTCyk1KgGA>

4. 3304 6h St SE 5-2-13 C114 2040 or -Exhibit 8 - 4. 3304 6h St SE 5-2-13 C114 2040

I requested the arrest of Tolland Butler, the operator and I discussed this during the 6 minutes or so that are missing in the middle of this audio. The OUC release is about 7 minutes and my recording is about 13 minutes. Bucksell who was mentioned was on Massengale's cc's and Massengale is a FEMS lawyer who claimed she didn't know about any deadlines to be concerned with, which is not credible at all.

My recording 802_1064 or -Exhibit 9 802_1064 of this conversation, which is about 6 minutes longer, is at <https://youtu.be/sZUyVV7Api8> or at <https://youtu.be/ic9n5IuqEQY>

802_1064 911 arrest Butler EMS

A quick transcription/comment of it that I submitted to another jurisdiction(s) is included.

(See attached exhibit for available transcript, Appendix D – Transcript 20130502 2041)

https://youtu.be/Rr0C7iW_e38

3. 3304 6th St SE 5-2-13 C113 2030

My recording 802_1062 May 2 2013 828p OPERATOR 7889 matches this call eventually. This guy insists I got into ambulance voluntarily, when I got on thinking I was going somewhere other than UMC, but then said he knew that I didn't go voluntarily. If you're being deceived about where you're going, that is kidnapping. 311 transferred me to 911, from there it matches.

<https://youtu.be/rUxbdvk39PU>

802_1062 311 arrest Butler EMS

May 2 2013 829p, called 311 this time.

(See attached exhibit for available transcript, Appendix D – Transcript 20130502 2029)

(See attached exhibit for available transcript, Appendix D – Transcript 20130502 2039)

MISSING - NOT RELEASED AT ALL

https://youtu.be/G_-Hwb3l_dl

802_1063 911 arrest Butler EMS, incoming

My recording, 802_1063 May 2 2013 839p, call FROM 911 female OPERATOR 5880 that was NOT released at all under FOIA but was in the range of dates I requested. This call followed the above call because the above call got me the police coming to my house to take a report, but this caller put a stop to that.

MISSING - NOT RELEASED

<https://youtu.be/QwSskO-e4fY>

802_1082 Public Info Ofcr EMS

(See attached exhibit for available transcript, Appendix D – Transcript 20130509)

May 9 2013 1125a, Called Public Information Officer at EMS because Coles never responded about clarifying the form so I could take issue if it needed to be corrected. Eventually, I was stonewalled by Coles and Ellerbe for years.

<https://youtu.be/KHGqJVE0l7s>

1. 3304 6th ST SE 5-16-13 C 118 1138

call re VirginMobile credit card fraud

<https://youtu.be/BL7jd9QuweI>

my recording 802_1112 May 16 2013 1136a Operator 6814, matches OUC release

(See attached exhibit for available transcript, Appendix D – Transcript 20130516)

20150518 1026a Voice1095 tammie creamer ouc

<https://youtu.be/6t3riezWFUY>

1026a May 18 2015 called Tammie Creamer. Just got May 18 2015 931a email from Creamer asking that I call her, so I did, although we'd been going back and forth on email. She had just gotten email about the April 1 2013 audio request. Every time they reverted to phone calls suddenly, what they communicated was something manipulative or suspect.

(See attached exhibit for available transcript, Appendix D – Transcript 20130518)

20150518 258p Voice1101 tammie creamer ouc

Called Creamer again May 18 2015 257p (1101)

Creamer had told me to call her the same day around 3p, which I did, and I got the phone ringing off the hook, then beeps, so I left a message with my contact information reminding of our previous conversation. She didn't call me back. (I apologize, but this was somehow omitted or not convertible for YouTube by the person who did all this work for me, but it's just a message to Tammie Creamer as described.)

OUC Release correspondence – these following documents were also exhibits to September 17 2018 Appellant's Opening Brief and are duplicated elsewhere as well, the May 2015 letter of release and the February 2016 and March 2016 letters.

20150526 Letter

February 3 2016 OUC Release

February 3 2016 Release Letter attachments

March 16 2016 OUC letter

OUC Correspondences, for these exhibits, please see November 26 2018 exhibits I filed with D. C. Court of Appeals as well as the filed document itself.

20150526 320 PM Creamer (Attachments: Final response.docx; Event_Chronology FOIA 3-29-2013; 1. FOIA Agolli 3-29-13.wma; Event_Chronology FOIA 4-1-2013; FOIA Agolli 4-1-13.wma)

Ex 1 20150508 254 PM Creamer doubt

Ex 2 20150518 208 PM Creamer (asking for this ruling of they can't give me the audio because my name is not on it and they can give me the chron because my name is not on it, in writing. Suddenly got a full release, including the April 1 2013 audio. Creamer recalled the email with both the chronos)

Ex 3 20150518 1036 AM Creamer w atts (the attachments are the March 29 2013 audio and chronology only, which is only a partial release and which you can see also in the OUC Release correspondence)

Ex 4 20150511 405 PM Creamer (only chronologies for both dates are released without explanation) These emails, which are somewhat repetitive, show that it took some to get a response about the April 1 2013 audio after being told originally that I would get the April 1 2013 audio even though I had initially also described that I didn't make the call but Alert1 made it for me. And that the additional effort was rife with split hairing trickery.

Emails after May 18, in particular May 26 2015, although I do attach here the email when both chronos and audios are released, are threads in the Brief's and original complaint exhibits, please read through these documents and all these exhibits as they tell the story well, even without the audios, although the audios prove all the more what I have to say, plus they contradict what Appellees' counsel describes in his motion/summary affirmance..

These following emails with Ridlehoover and attachments are in the exhibits of the November 26 2018 filing I did at the D. C. Court of Appeals.

Ex 6 20130606 348 PM Ridlehoover att IMG_20120715_151401

Ex 6 20130606 348 PM Ridlehoover att IMG_20120715_151407

Ex 6 20130606 348 PM Ridlehoover att Updated Sprint Form May 17 2013 USE THIS

Ex 6 20130606 348 PM Ridlehoover

Ex 7 20130606 405 PM Ridlehoover att 10-85B2D8DE-114718-960

Ex 7 20130606 405 PM Ridlehoover

I am attaching here the redacted Alert1 Chron because I tried to see it online and it was such a poor quality I could barely recognize it, so I am attaching here a copy of that. I didn't see all I know I filed but they didn't have images for everything. The Holman definitions and with my handwritten questions should be online with the D. C. Court of Appeals, from my perspective, even though I'm the appellant, I only know how to access the docket, I don't know how to view the documents themselves. But the exhibits of the September 17 2018 Opening Brief, I refer you to and they are as follows:

-Ex 12 Holman quest Anna M. Agolli April 1 Definitions scan (with my handwritten comments on it)

-Exhibit 1 Aug 29 2017 Kravitz dismiss

-Exhibit 2 Dismissal for 17-3059

-Exhibit 3 overly article

-Exhibit 4 Alert 1 redacted (This one is attached here on paper because I was able to see a scan of it on Superior Court site and I couldn't read it.)

-Exhibit 5 1b-Event_Chronology FOIA AGOLLI

Exhibit 5 and 6 20160203 20150526 Letter

-Exhibit 6 1a-Event_Chronology FOIA AGOLLI ._.2

-Exhibit 10 January 24 2014 ePCR

-Exhibit 11 Event_Chronology FOIA 1725 RHODE ISLAND AVE NW 1-24-14.pdf

-Exhibit 13 Motion filed October 2017 that was technically

-Exhibit 14 2 _Father, Forgive them..._ (febfor1.htm)

-Exhibit 15 Ex 3 _Father, Forgive them...._ (febfor2.htm)

More Tammie Creamer conversations:

https://youtu.be/Yu2rV_7wf-A

1257p April 17 2015 OUC (Voice1037)

(See attached exhibit for available transcript, Appendix G – Transcript 20150417)

8888

143p April 17 2015 (Voice1038) (Voice1041)

Voice1038

<https://youtu.be/V4TqalybObs>

Voice1041

<https://youtu.be/-qkthNEYOJI>

(See attached exhibit for available transcript, Appendix D – Transcript 20150417 1343)

Called Creamer again re web error, etc.

Steven Williams OUC FOIA Officer April 20 2015 225p (Voice1046)

<https://youtu.be/xJW26i2lGVc>

Follow-up call from Steven Williams, gave him additional information.

(See attached exhibit for available transcript, Appendix D – Transcript 20150420)

Voice1041 kreamer out

<https://youtu.be/-qkthNEYOJI>

Voice1042 dc superior court

<https://youtu.be/lLJIA5lzAEI>

20150424 232p Voice1051 ouc f up

<https://youtu.be/tFKyZyhprMc>

(See attached exhibit for available transcript, Appendix D – Transcript 20150424)

Tried to follow up.

20150424 236p Voice1052 Tami kreamer ouc msg

https://youtu.be/5w-W_3Y4sYc

followed up again.

(See attached exhibit for available transcript, Appendix D – Transcript 20150424 1436)

20150512 1155a (Voice1091) supervisor ouc

<https://youtu.be/RHR59BzWnVQ>

1155A May 12 2015 730 0490 called Steven Williams' number and left message requesting audios.

(See attached exhibit for available transcript, Appendix D – Transcript 20150512)

More about MPD handling of Bob Richardson/hacking/stalking issue:

https://youtu.be/y_09L0hXFVo

802_0775 MPD 911

frustration with MPD behavior for the purpose of avoiding to take a report, I did what I was told and Sgt. Washington didn't respond to any of my attempts to contact him, and as you can see, is one of the defendants and he repeatedly avoided being served papers too.

These are the audios that I requested under FOIA, some were not released and some were. I list them accordingly uploading my own recording and the released recording under FOIA, or only my recording when the OUC recording was not released. My recordings were done on speaker phone in my home.

MISSING - NOT RELEASED

<https://youtu.be/8nnMzg2MNUk>

802_1113 mpd can't find building

(See attached exhibit for available transcript, Appendix D – Transcript 20130516 1215)

<https://youtu.be/IoO-6wK0lbc>

802_1122 May 16 2013 431p voice mail from Officer Barker

(See attached exhibit for available transcript, Appendix D – Transcript 20130516 1631)

More proof as per my questions presented of what occurred right before Ridlehoover sent social workers instead of police to take a report:

<https://youtu.be/kf5iJwhnUAY>

Calls with Sgt. Phifer at Financial Crime and Fraud/MPD, cut off

(See attached exhibit for available transcript, Appendix D – Transcript 20130604)

https://youtu.be/ycO-3K_hyh0

802_1205

I call Phifer back June 4 2013 646p, and his voicemail box is full.

<https://youtu.be/WFYHC0aTQuY>

(13) VN803996 bob richardson 3 vms July 20-27 2012-195494445

More proof that this Bob Richardson exists. MPD ultimately told me he didn't exist and when I presented also photographic proof, Ridlehoover sent social worker to my home instead of a police officer to take a report.

https://youtu.be/_rKKTcSSoQw

(24) VN804083 bob richardson-833444097 June 17 2013 731p

More proof that this Bob Richardson exists. MPD ultimately told me he didn't exist and when I presented also photographic proof, Ridlehoover sent social worker to my home instead of a police officer to take a report.

<https://youtu.be/72exVI0VfBw>

(27) VN804178 richardson September 5 2012 1256p1544979293

More proof that this Bob Richardson exists. MPD ultimately told me he didn't exist and when I presented also photographic proof, Ridlehoover sent social worker to my home instead of a police officer to take a report.

The above 3 recordings from my voice mail from Bob Richardson, the stalker/hacker, I had sent to Tonia Jones, so there was no question that he existed from the beginning and even what his phone number was. I think this is what is meant when the police say, disappear it. They disappeared Bob Richardson and the evidence of stalking and hacking simply via delusional denial that they expected me to go along with, and when I didn't but rather sent photographs of Richardson and his vehicle, Ridlehoover sent social workers to my house. Richardson may have gotten rid of the phone number by the time I spoke to Phifer but the MPD had this information since December 2012 and Phifer should have gotten access to it if he really did do his own probe. Plus police have ways of finding the number and owners, it was a blackberry phone, not a burner phone, and they got my complaint while he was still using that phone number to harass me. If they don't have the know-how, they're supposed to contact the FBI or someone who does know. What they did was pretend not to know, not to understand, to take issue with how much evidence as it created work for them that they wanted me to think should not have been necessary were it not for my reports and evidence that they now had to make disappear.

802_0789 MPD Sgt Simms

This Sgt. Simms obviously hit voice mail and when Gardner got on he's saying hello repeatedly. No, he didn't ever respond. He came to my door thereafter and I brought the Sprint subpoena issue to his attention and he did NOTHING as regarded the Sprint form to subpoena the records of Bob Richardson/hacker/stalker's abuses, he didn't want it. Years before that, my front door had been rammed in and was hanging open by the top hinge, he took a report all the while gratuitously and extremely rudely pretending to be a hysterical female while I quietly listened to that and tried to tell him what I thought he should know. I suppose if he made all those hysterical comments, he could say

those things were said in that way and presume that everyone he told would presume it was coming from me when it was him. And then nothing happened after that report, no investigation. This is a longstanding front to protect the subjects of my federal complaint by deflecting legitimate complaints and also retaliate for my filing complaint against MPD.

ALL CONVERSATIONS WITH ANITA MASSENGALE IN APRIL 2013 AND WITH GERALD COLES IN MAY 2013 WERE NOT RELEASED. MY TRANSCRIBED RECORD OF THESE CALLS IS AS FOLLOWS.

802_0995 April 9 2013 1020p

<https://youtu.be/0Zv-Xt803kg>

Called 311 re ambulance issue, wanted to know how to circumvent going to UMC, where they tell people with heart or stroke-like symptoms to go wait their turn in the waiting room. Eventually I wound up referred to Anita Massengale.

802_0999 ambulance

<https://youtu.be/MT--PCF48X0>

April 10 2013 210p Called 202 673 3331, FEMS, spoke to Massengale first time.

(See attached exhibit for available transcript, Appendix D – Transcript 20130410)

802_1001 massengale

<https://youtu.be/z30kgIsqbHM>

April 10 2013 519p Voicemail from 202 715 2857 From Massengale, asking me to call her April 11.

802_1002 massengale

<https://youtu.be/DHxLVL3HTG8>

April 11 2013 12p, Massengale called me.

(See attached exhibit for available transcript, Appendix D – Transcript 20130411)

802_1048 anita massengale

<https://youtu.be/DB3ZZmfWf1c>

April 26 2013 441p I called Anita Massengale per her email of April 25 2013 to talk instead of putting everything in writing.

(See attached exhibit for available transcript, Appendix D – Transcript 20130426)

802_1050 massengale

<https://youtu.be/ggPhXEe6aQc>

April 29 2013 728a, Massengale ambush called me.

(See attached exhibit for available transcript, Appendix D – Transcript 20130429)

Following are the calls with UMC prior to calling ambulance so I could be taken to someplace other than UMC. Massengale told me 3 calls with UMC was an EMTALA violation, but she didn't file a complaint with EMTALA.

802_0971 April 1 2013 UMC Johnny Johnson

https://youtu.be/TgI1hq_wF6Q

April 1 2013 120a call to UMC where someone said her name was Johnny Johnson, MD.

802_0972 call Personnel
<https://youtu.be/sCxP13xx8Jk>
April 1 2013 142a again.

802_0973 3 beeps phone went dead
<https://youtu.be/CJUHxCyFVDx4>
April 1 2013 UMC emergency room

APPENDIX E Questions Presented are not referring only to one issue. There is a long history with the MPD for which the potential for lawsuits that can be filed exist, in the end, do we want as a nation for our public servants to be able to take such self-serving license. This is an example, it is certainly not the only complaint I had against the MPD, but I did record some calls and get a FOIA release that can show a history of how the MPD and their Office of Police Complaints serves the protection of officers, not obtaining justice or a proper outcome, even if it's really a lot easier to just write a criminal report than to do all this calisthenic to avoid that plus absolutely to avoid any misconduct or other wrong to be the case for an officer who went the extra mile to protect the subjects of my complaints – and all that is paid by taxpayers while being done out of the service they're due. There are exhibits, including the audio of the Officer's behavior, plus other audios. The purpose of these exhibits is to show that there is a history and longstanding misconduct, cover-ups, manipulation, deception, etc., so much so that there is a clear interest in insuring as possible (they can't control every officer but they can get around them usually, flip them, or reassign them) so there is never a proper report taken for violence, intrusion, aggravated harassment, etc., and if one is per chance taken, there is no follow-up or investigation. An example for past OPC treatment, I filed a complaint against Brian Murphy at MPD, I got a letter in response that misdated the issue about which I complained by about 5 years (who files a complaint due within 45 days 5 years late?), which event was also not described correctly. So this stuff with Officer Wilson is nothing unique but just the example I am providing because it wasn't automatically derailed but went through a taxpayer paid song and dance mediation first and then no report. I had to send innumerable faxes and emails to get a FOIA release when the case was finally closed, and then it got lost in the mail in December 2014 too and I was emailed it later in 2015 when I followed up yet again and they actually responded. January 2014 they assigned to another person, Investigation was supposed to be wrapped up about 3 months after the mediation, which mediation was in February 2013 when it was assigned to Rebecca Beyer. OPC dragged their feet for a year. Rebecca had told me that he was set to retire in about a year. Is that what they waited for to act, when oops! they could no longer act because he's gone.

Appendix E exhibits
13-0122 (1) my initial complaint
13-0122 (2-1)-2 final complaint as signed of by me (redone by Rebecca Beyer)
May 14 2014 letter saying they dragged their feet for a year and now we can't do anything because Wilson's gone.

<https://youtu.be/H-ZpSpO2OzE>
802_0212
Audio of Ofc. Eric Wilson's response to my 911 call

<https://youtu.be/AKmv103aC48> or at <https://youtu.be/peQox0LNlc4>

802_0777 Bacon Mediator at MPD
Explanation re self-serving mediation.

(See attached exhibit for available transcript, Appendix D – Transcript 201402)

<https://youtu.be/Kv8aXI46O3E>

<https://youtu.be/AKmv103aC48>

802_0852 Mediator MPD Wilson, I tell Bacon about the situations I reported, lock replacements and so forth. Nothing was accomplished at the mediation.

<https://youtu.be/JKcsVkJfJiY>

802_0853 continued 0852 MPD Wilson

I forgot to say on the audio what time and day this previous call was.

APPENDIX F

These are additional proofs and evidence that the situation exists rather than is something the police just need to break to me that it doesn't exist so that their associates/subjects of the federal complaint get away with crime. They are attached as paper copies of emails.

Matt Smith exhibits and associated Transgeneral/Loverde complaint issues:

Based on the intrusion that is apparent in these emails to Captain Matt Smith of the Arlington County Police Department (where the issues of the complaint against subjects Arlington Bishop Paul Loverde and Trans-General originated after an initial complaint to the U. S. Postal Inspector) regarding the U. S. Department of Justice complaint to these correspondences

Matt Smith was flipped too eventually. Everywhere I went to get justice, the people handling would first be helpful and honestly help, then they would either get suddenly transferred and there was some kind of realignment in personnel that resulted in my getting yelled at or otherwise ill-used over my complaint or gas-lighted.

APPENDIX G - WHEN FEMS FINALLY WAS FORCED TO STOP STONEWALLING ME BECAUSE OF HHS

CONVERSATION WITH TINA CURTIS

Called to get a quicker answer:

<https://youtu.be/fFm3EF6ggF0>

1145a March 30 2015 Monday 202 673 6320 (0990)

I called to get a quicker result so I just hung up.

<https://youtu.be/B64ogp-QWRw>

122p March 30 2015 Monday 202 673 6320 (0993)

Tried again in the hope of getting a live person.

(See attached exhibit for available transcript, Appendix G – Transcript 20150330)

<https://youtu.be/30yGH96dovE>

209p April 3 2015 202 879 1010 DC Superior Court (1009)

Per Angela Washington's telling me it was necessary, I went about filing this petition for the codes.

(See attached exhibit for available transcript, Appendix G – Transcript 20150403)

I filed the papers on Friday, April 10 2015 and FedEx (served a copy on) Washington at FEMS, because I researched and learned they had a drop for after hours because I am physically disabled and would not have gotten there in any reasonable amount of time prior to their closing, which I presumed was around 5p. I am not a lawyer, I thought this might be sufficient to start with and if not, I at least might have gotten the process started. Ultimately, this only cost me the FedEx fees plus the trouble of getting the forms, etc., while having done it in person would have cost me \$60, and it turned out not to be necessary apparently.

<https://youtu.be/DEb2C4vi7IM>

1002a April 14 2015 Monday DC Superior Court (1020)

They called me with instructions.

<https://youtu.be/Yeb1C400zHk>

1140a April 14 2015 Monday Angela Washington from the Executive Office FEMS (1024)

She called to let me know there's no hearing date

April 17 2015 1158a Called 311 to find out number for OUC to get FOIA for March 29 2013 and April 1 2013 audios. (Sorry, no audio)

(See attached exhibit for available transcript, Appendix G – Transcript 20150417 1158)

<https://youtu.be/3yvV5I5bXno>

215p April 15 2015 Tina Curtis/FEMS (Voice1033) This was a 2-hour-plus call.

(See attached exhibit for available transcript, Appendix G – Transcript 20150415)

ADDENDUM - LIST OF PARTIES AND COUNSEL - 7pp

LIST OF DEFENDANTS WHO WERE NOT REPRESENTED BY COUNSEL, 2pp

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

I am not a lawyer and don't know how to do this, I've done the best I could with my explanations. I have attached a sheet with laws and references, I do not where they belong if here or below or constitutional, and I do not have specific pages to reference but rather the ideas of this information that I found on the internet to put here. I don't have access to actual law books, etc. I apologize and cringe at the work I did but it's the best I could manage. So please see the attached 2 sheets. Thank you for your patience.

STATUTES AND RULES

Since I am asking for a departure from overtly unjust precedent based on common sense and what is just, the real purpose of going to court over anything in the first place, I'm not sure it's applicable that a current law can be cited to correct something that should be corrected in matter what but based on technicalities Defendants win the court case -- as in, don't owe damages or costs -- but also do nothing to correct the matters that require correction if only as a matter of their own integrity, which these government employees clearly don't have. A government should not take advantage of the haplessness of a plaintiff to legally overcome the claims that have been proven and win the case citing technicalities when the plaintiff has been harmed by government employees after the same employees who won the case stonewalled that plaintiff and otherwise behaved badly to tie that plaintiff's hands while insuring their own reputations with more falsification against that plaintiff. The technicalities, if actually applicable, would not have been at issue but for behaviors of the government employees but then the defendants are, what?, helpless to correct the situation because of those technicalities. Overcoming a lawsuit over technicalities does not tie the government's hands to correct the situation especially if there is proof -- indeed, that government should be concerned that employees such as the ones involved in this case are actually working for that government and representing it, rather than insuring the interests of those employees and trying to do what bullies do when covering their mess. This did not happen here, the harm that was done has not been corrected in any way, although these government employees tried to do a correction that was helpful only to them and bullied plaintiff to get that done their way. What happened here was kidnapping, falsification of medical records and reckless endangerment of Plaintiff, Medicaid fraud, etc., and now that was done with impunity, these employees also want to insure that the records falsely created by these actions remain as is so as to have gained the whole corrupt purpose of their violent and fraudulent actions in the first place.

Amendments 13 and 14 of U. S. Constitution. In this particular situation, I was kidnapped and the response was to protect the perpetrators rather than correct the situation, the record which was falsified, the structure under which this occurred was not really altered nor was any improvement made known but rather I was told I could dispute the falsified record in writing to have it on record that there was a dispute, yet I did dispute it and asked for a FOIA and that dispute was not on record, only what the government did to be able to have a false record about me. DC government is tyrannical. When someone does something wrong, whether it is misconduct and criminal or just bad work out of laziness or incompetence, they just protect each other and stonewall the person they ill-used. This is a cast system because these people are supposed to be respecting the rights of their citizens and serving them, not ill-using them for their own benefit. That's something you do to slaves in plantation days where you don't have to account for how you treat your "property", and it is always the case that the plantation owner is right. And the country itself does not have to account for how it treats people it chooses to discriminate against because the different jurisdictions had laws that served that purpose although they didn't treat each other like that, just the discriminated-against group was treated OTHER poorly. And those such a system served and those in power, governments, either enacted laws to enable these injustices or behaved corruptly so as to insure the injustices were never corrected. Might makes right. Abuse of discretion. And courts nit-pick search for that needle in a haystack technicality that can be attributed to the employees stonewalling and other behavior, because in the end, courts are government employees. All for one and one for all.

The Plaintiff here was attacked by DC police via her call for an ambulance because the MPD already had retaliated against her for filing federal complaint over their protecting Bishop of Arlington's then Paul Loverde. It's not unknown that police have for too long protected Catholic clergy from the criminal consequences of their actions, but one day that protection was somehow dented. We've all heard of cases like Rodney King and Ferguson and so many others that now people can film on their smart phones where the police brutalize citizens or civilians because they think they can and will get away with it. They have discretion but they abuse it. It took Justice Warren's decision to make a difference in changing how Jim Crow was perpetrated on African-Americans in separate but equal. We the people are not slaves of government employees and persons with authority, they are at our service yet they enslave whoever they wish with the abuse of authority, the abuse of discretion. The true purpose of a government agency can not get lost in technicalities obsessed upon by those who would benefit by tying the hands of those citizens who have been harmed by government, its employees, it abuse of authority and discretion, its favoritism of one person or group over another, making time for and doing what they are NOT being paid to do while wasting taxpayer dollars to avoid doing what they are employed and elected to do. And then sparing no expense or effort to protect their interests and jobs and false reputations, and whatever other self-serving necessity made easy by the job and the authority it has.

Table of Authorities Continuation Sheets

Other Relevant Laws

42 USC Section 1983 lawsuits/Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents

Under 42 USC Section 1983,

Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured ...

U. S. Supreme Court already recognized Bivens claims for violations, that plaintiffs may sue for damages if federal officials violate their Constitutional rights, as regards to the 4th Amendment (seizure of a person without a warrant based on probably cause), 5th Amendment, and 8th Amendment.

U. S. Supreme Court already handed down the current rule for qualified immunity: [G]overnment officials performing discretionary functions generally are shielded from liability for civil damages insofar as their conduct does not violate clearly established statutory or constitutional rights of which a reasonable person would have known." Therefore, the application of qualified immunity no longer depends upon an official's subjective state of mind, but on whether or not a reasonable person in the official's position would have known their actions were in line with clearly established legal principles.

Is a call for an ambulance for stroke-like symptoms an opportunity for an officer to abuse his discretion to turn it into a mental issue self-servingly given of a federal complaint filed? Plus, ignore reported stroke-like symptoms that are the purpose of the ambulance call and go unaddressed as a result? There is a clearly established issue of fraud inherent in doing this, first of all, and then, of course, the violence, whether covert as was the case here with the use of duplicity or with openly direct violence, which directly violate Constitutional rights. And in this case, given federal complaint against the MPD preceding the ambulance calls, it is also a felony for retaliation for filing a federal complaint. Qualified immunity does not protect officials who violate "clearly established statutory or constitutional rights of which reasonable person would have known." Whoever instructed the call taker and the EMT to handle the call as they did had to be in a superior position of authority to be able to direct an subordinate to falsely document something other than the reality, and the misdocumentation in this case was done PRIOR to the arrival of the EMT at the residence and in spite of the report that was made. This is an objective standard, meaning that the standard does not depend on the subjective state of mind of the official but rather on whether a reasonable person would determine that the relevant conduct violated clearly-established law.

The U. S. Supreme Court previously specifically rejected "good faith" as a defense against 1983, which held until the invention of qualified immunity in 1967.

The statute of limitations on kidnapping is 3 years, I reported it shortly after it occurred, and repeatedly thereafter, and was stonewalled and otherwise disregarded and ill-used while FEMS, et al. protected the EMT, et al. Also, the offense included official misconduct, fraud or breach of fiduciary trust, which is a 9 year statute of limitations for a felony (kidnapping is a felony). And plaintiff asks that the action of the U. S. Supreme Court include that the criminal consequences be immediately applied and applicable however long it takes for this issue to be straightened in whatever jurisdiction because I reported it to FEMS within days only to get interference running and I called the MPD for an arrest May 2 2013, not long after it happened and not long after my report was no longer welcome at FEMS and within a day or so, I was stonewalled yet the MPD required that FEMS report a kidnapping if there was a violation

of protocol and the definitions most recently received by Plaintiff show that there was definitely no protocol supporting the actions of the EMT. Plus, the EMT didn't act on his own, the call taker misdocumented just as the EMT did before arriving at my residence, and neither had a reason to do so. Someone higher than they instructed them to do that.

In an illegal search of Dr. Joseph Zadeh's medical records without a warrant, a clear example of misconduct but dismissed under qualified immunity. Even as the Fifth Circuit Court ruled in favor of this claim, Justice Don Willett stated that the U. S. Supreme Court's precedents, themselves, were a problem.

“The court is right about Dr. Zadeh's rights: They were violated...But owing to a legal *deus ex machina*-- the 'clearly established law' prong of qualified-immunity analysis-- the violation eludes vindication.

Even on the Supreme Court, both the right and left have objected. Clarence Thomas has expressed “growing concern with our qualified immunity jurisprudence,” stating that there is no apparent basis for it in the original intent of the law. Justice Sonya Sotomayor has noted a “disturbing trend” of siding with police officers using excessive force, with qualified immunity.

“We have not hesitated to summarily reverse courts for wrongly denying officers the protection of qualified immunity in cases involving the use of force....But we rarely intervene where courts wrongly afford officers the benefit of qualified immunity in these same cases.”

Police should be held to a higher standard – there should not even be the appearance of impropriety in a judge or elected or other high-ranking official. Not all police officers are captains or chiefs, but they are officers, they have the authority to hold a person in custody, to seize property and even to kill under the right circumstances – it may be subject to a trial where the person in custody is innocent until found guilty, but they can put their hands on your person and retain you. And for all people, that is the difference between being free or not, no matter how short-lived or permanent. It is a Constitutional right to be reckoned with. Under the principle that all are created equal and should be seen as equal under the eyes of the law, it has been argued that police should be held to a higher standard of behavior than normal people, even public servants who do not have the authority police officers have, for the purpose of balancing out their powers. They have all that power, they shouldn't be held to a lower standard where they can carry out with license rather than responsibility. It would be a military state if police were able to have the power to even shoot to kill but without the responsibility of a higher standard, rather the privilege of a lower standard so they can use their positions for their own self-serving purposes and the interests of their powerful friends. This is a corrupt state and it's not what people pay taxes for, it is not what people elect officials to carry out. No one wants that except for corrupt police officers and government officials and powerful persons or entities who make use of such corrupt government personnel. Catholic priests in these United States have gotten away with atrocities in this country against the most defenseless as a result of such corruption.

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

n/a 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**:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix A 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 District of Columbia Superior Court court appears at Appendix B&C to the petition and is

reported at _____; or,
 has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
 is unpublished. *

*I do not know if it is published but I am attaching the judgments directly from the Courts.

JURISDICTION

For cases from **federal courts**:

n/a The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was _____.

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**:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was December 14 2018. A copy of that decision appears at Appendix A.

No petition for rehearing was filed except for the appeal at the DC Court of Appeals where I went through all the steps required. 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 PROVISIONS INVOLVED

U. S. Constitutional Amendments 4, 5, 13 and 14

Amendments to the U. S. Constitution

Amendment 4 Search and Seizure, the DC government through the actions of its employees, police, OUC and FEMS, infiltrated a call to an ambulance for stroke-like symptoms and before arriving at Plaintiff's house, documented falsely and in spite of OUC audio other sensitive issues including that these were supposedly supposed to be due to the EMT's impression yet they were documented falsely prior to the arrival of the EMT. And then when DC Government gave Plaintiff the definitions of the items on the ambulance medical record of the run, they translated information that was not part of the definitions request to cover for the falsified record the EMT had made. They did this to discredit Plaintiff, and it included entering into an ambulance run and treatment at the hospital, kidnapping Plaintiff and falsely documenting as that false documentation would flip the validity of Plaintiff's legitimate federal complaint given that her mental competence now was falsely documented as lacking.

Amendment 5 Rights of Persons/Amendment 13 Slavery and Involuntary Servitude. My rights and property, the costs of this writ and other before and other cases and issues that I have had to scramble to pursue are taking my liberty and life and enslaving it to these requirements, law enforcement keeping me at bay while protecting the interests of those against whom I am being caused to complain. My private property is taken for unjust public use by virtue of abuse of discretion in this way to protect from criminal consequences those against whom I have had to complain, and law enforcement, government, is the one that abuses its discretion in enabling and maintaining this situation. I have to spend my effort and time doing this when I should have the liberty to choose to do otherwise.

Amendment 14 Rights Guaranteed: Privileges and Immunities of Citizenship, Due Process, and Equal Protection.

This type of treatment from govt, law enforcement, is something that concerns the entire country & petitioner requests the Court to appoint counsel to handle.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Petitioner had been having stroke-like symptoms and was told by the neurologist that when she experiences numbness, loss of motor ability, blindness, etc., go to the hospital as she might be having a stroke. Ultimately, Petitioner was found to have lacunar strokes on her films, but if she hadn't, one can have a mini stroke without it showing in a film, or it can full blown and even kill the person. Most people know or understand this.

April 1 2013 Petitioner called Alert1 because of blindness and numbness, etc., which she reported to Alert1 so they could call the ambulance plus see if they could finagle not going to United Medical Center because a couple of days before Petitioner had been to UMC and was told by the doctor that if she could manage it, she should go elsewhere for stroke-like symptoms because, for instance, they didn't have anyone scheduled to do MRI, etc., they just didn't have what stroke centers had to address a stroke but there were hospitals that did, but by all means, go there if you can't go to a better suited place. And so, in addition, if the ambulance could take Petitioner to another hospital, Petitioner was asking Alert1 to see if that could be managed while she got ready for the arrival of the ambulance.

The ambulance arrived and the EMT was not listening to the Petitioner but apparently had some other agenda and was putting words into Petitioner's mouth rather than heeding what she told him. For instance, she was telling him that she was having a stroke, and he was saying yes a stroke but not really, or something along those lines. Petitioner told him specifically that if they were going to UMC, she didn't want to go, but rather to a place that was certified for strokes. The EMT was already apparently dispatched to UMC and he didn't tell Petitioner then and there when she said she didn't want to go to UMC, nor when she got into the ambulance. Within 5 minutes, they were at UMC and she told the EMT that if he had told her that's where they were going, she wouldn't have gotten on the ambulance and that he could not charge for the ambulance run, not to her nor to Medicare, and that she was not signing the assignment of benefits. Petitioner had Medicare QMB, so this automatically means they cannot charge Medicaid either, although did not specifically state this.

Unbeknownst to Petitioner, the EMT wrote as the reason for not signing his electronic form that Petitioner was mentally unable to do so. Petitioner had not been wheeled into the hospital because she was not planning to stay but she did want to inquire of the doctor she had seen a couple of days before and see if he would advise anything, if he happened to be there. He was but Petitioner never had a chance to speak to him. The receiving nurse refused to do the normal intake of patient's who are transported by ambulance to an ER and said, after looking at the EMT's tablet, that "for that she can sit in the waiting room." Petitioner was also supposed to register herself before going to sit behind about 13 other parties in the waiting room. Petitioner went to the phone and called a cab and went to another hospital where she had learned they had the stroke center qualification.

She contacted FEMS and when she was about to get help right after she received the falsified medical record by the EMT, she was suddenly stonewalled. No matter what she did – and she contacted Chief Ellerbe who stonewalled her too – she was unable to get assistance or even acknowledgment from FEMS. She had contacted the police the day before receiving the record (the calls that included the tampered audio) and they kept referring her back to FEMS and FEMS basically said that they had to decide that a crime was committed, and only then would the police arrest the EMT. MPD said the same. FEMS just took the EMT's impression and word for it, even though they had the OUC chronology, the audio for April 1 2013, and knowledge that I had a complaint because with the treatment from FEMS, I wound up being stonewalled so the complaint was never filed, I had no where to file it with because even Ellerbe was stonewalling me. I contacted other federal agencies, including

HHS/OCR. Eventually, HHS forced FEMS to respond to me. And in doing so, they were manipulating how they could close their file and look good while demanding and manipulating that I cooperate, and telling me that the decision would not change, only that something would be put in the file showing there was a dispute about the record. I sent them what I was told was necessary to have something in the file to show dispute according to what I was told (and it was forced information, they did not want to give me that and avoided it as possible) while I decided what I needed to do to get that EMT arrested and my file corrected, and then asked for my record, and the dispute information was not in the record.

I asked for the definitions of the information on the medical record, FEMS has coded acronyms and such that people who don't work with OUC don't really know the meaning of if they don't get the information from a trusted source (FEMS was not a trusted source, apparently), and the information not only was clearly incorrect in certain aspects but to avoid making any explanation for what the EMT documented and did, they pulled another ambulance report that was done neutrally and used that information to define their codes instead, thereby avoiding to give the definitions of the April 1 2013 medical information and chronology. However, in delivering this falsified information to Petitioner, they included that they did in fact avoid making a Medicare claim and made a Medicaid claim that they could easily have expected would be denied, and it was denied. However, they created a record with the EMT's falsified discrediting information that follows my SSN, which is what they wanted in the first place and all along, just something to discredit me.

December 2012 Petitioner called the police because her phone had emitted text (not by Petitioner's hand) to another phone that then responded to the text. The person who had done this turned up in Petitioner's travels and then stalked her. Petitioner took a picture of him, the same picture she sent to MPD when they went through all their investigations (i.e., backward flips to avoid evidence and derail the investigation), which included calling the hacker and complimenting his phony business card and the like, to tell me that he didn't exist and did I have any other information about him. They didn't know I had more information, apparently, so I sent them the picture and also an MMS where he included a picture of a white truck/van that he wanted \$2500 for. Suddenly, I got a call from a social worker who was trying to find my home because the incompetent who authorized it, Ridlehoover, didn't give her an accurate address. I didn't correct the address and told her not to come. I still got another call from the same number as was used by the social worker maybe a few days later. I wasn't home so if she got a corrected address, she didn't find me.

Petitioner eventually requested the 911 tape (it had not occurred to her that the call taker had fraudulently documented the symptoms Alert 1 conveyed nor had it ever occurred to Petitioner that eventually when she needed to get the audios for the calls to MPD and FEMS to get the EMT arrested but when she saw the kind of blatant dishonesty they were capable of, she began asking for these things) to find out where the false diagnosis came from, and apparently, before the EMT ever arrived at her home, the call taker documented mental type issues, not the stroke like symptoms Alert 1 reported, and when the EMT arrived, he was ready to diagnose the same as the call taker ~~no matter what~~ he saw and was told. Petitioner explained the stroke issues, the history, the neurologist and so forth to the EMT, none of that was documented correctly, or even at all, in the ePCR (the medical record taken by the EMT). He already had his instructions from before he ever got to the residence and what he documented he saw and heard and observed was going to reflect those instructions rather than what he actually saw and heard.

Unbeknownst to Petitioner on April 1 2013 however, Alert 1 reported stroke symptoms but the call taker and the EMT documented otherwise prior to the EMT even arriving at Petitioner's home when all they had to go on realistically was what Alert 1 told OUC. And there is proof. Petitioner submitted a

CD to District of Columbia Court of Appeals of the Alert 1 call released by OUC (with some difficulty but eventually released inasmuch as Petitioner advised OUC that she too had recorded the same call) the April 1 2013 call, and Alert 1's chronology where they correctly reported the symptoms to be stroke-like while the call taker and the EMT documented mental issues, before ever seeing Petitioner and speaking to her. So the problem began prior to the EMT coming over and had nothing to do with Petitioner's condition and reason for calling an ambulance but rather the ambulance call was being used for some other agenda. Only certain people have control over a call taker or the tampering of a police tape, and it's not some janitor, but someone important, important enough to have agreements with other important people or entities who can negotiate having the MPD in their back pocket. (Please see my October 2 2018 Opening Brief and the Response to Defendants response dated January 3 2018, which is part of the online record and contains the response to why would anyone ever do such a thing type of allegations and hearsay by the Defendants' counsel plus I included proof that it was done no matter the why. I included a CD to prove the tampering of the audio to get the EMT arrested and Alert 1's chronology as opposed to OUC's plus the audio for that, which flies in the face of OUC and FEMS' falsified documentation on April 1 2013 and thereafter, which adhered to the theory of the more lies you tell, the more you need to tell to hide the original and ongoing lies, plus that while you keep telling lies, more and more of the truth reveals itself).

This is the basic gist of the lawsuits but looking at the case history, assuming that the U. S. Supreme Court only requests paper copy of the final judgments and so has access to the entire record electronically, Petitioner was dismissed on all levels and so is here petitioning a writ of certiorari. Petitioner could have been contacted to correct at least the falsified record but the original lies were followed by further lies and Petitioner filed additional complaints as a result. All have been dismissed, pending the last 3 cases now at DC Court of Appeals that regard the tampered police tape (that Petitioner also recorded on her end so she can prove that the audio was tampered before being released via FOIA) that is missing 6 minutes in the middle where Petitioner discusses the arrest of the EMT, etc. The online record is available for the details, arguments, etc., that are not included here.

While if I learned that the DCCA contacted the agencies of this lawsuit to see if they could still correct the situation although without a judgment per se with possible damages given that they ruled that the technicalities of how I handled plus public duty doctrine warranted a dismissal, I would believe it, however it appeared that the cases in the courts also smacked at times with preference for the defendants, who were DC employees and ex-DC employees. For instance, at the D. C. Superior Court level, even though I had IFP status, I was held responsible for the service of papers as though I had not been granted IFP. Because I filed additional cases, I learned that this was wrong because I kept on top of the service of papers as though I didn't have IFP and was told by the newer case judge that it was their responsibility but the Judge in these 4 cases of this petition held it against me that Tina Curtis' service green card was not returned by the deadline and that I didn't file a motion to extend for that when in fact the Court personnel was supposed to do that. I also filed an extension to serve John Alter on October 1 2016 and the paperwork was returned to me stating I forgot to include payment for filing when I had IFP status, so it was filed October 4 2016 instead when I went back with the returned documents to point out that in fact I had IFP status. I consented to extensions as requested by the Defendants' counsel but Defendants' counsel was very persnickety about consenting to my requests for extension although the Judge did grant one of them to extend the file date from a Friday to the following Monday, as the filed document would only just sit in the overnight box during that time anyway, and without the consent of the counsel. And I am physically disabled, I was never able to keep up with the situation although I met my deadlines, but there were court personnel errors that needed to be corrected plus one of the process servers filed an inaccurate piece of paper and I did not know she had done that although I had been inquiring and inquiring about what happened to the John Alter

service of process and all the dates for which she attempted service because from August 16 to September 8 or thereabouts she had let it sit, and I still have to file a praecipe to show that inaccuracy and that I did what I needed to do to insure the time was extended but I had no control over the process server's actions once I told her repeatedly that further attempts needed to be made so I could report them and request an extension. And, of course, it was all the DCSC's personnel responsibility in the first place but I didn't know then that I should not have had to worry about extensions. Although the October 1 2016 motion to extend does show that the paperwork filed by the process server was not known to me or I would not have filed the October 1 2016 motion, nor gone back to the court on October 4 2016 to insure it was filed and that the staff knew I was IFP so I did not need to include payment. Counsel for Defendants filed a document to which I needed to respond within 3 days, and mailed it to me postmarked AFTER my response was due. At the D. C. Court of Appeals level, I had been to the ER and needed additional time to file my opening brief (I had been to the ER in July and September) and received immediate and glad consent from the OAG. So I had an extension to October 2 2017 and Defendants received extension to November 6 2017. OAG didn't file anything on November 6, 7, or 8. On November 9 2017, without explaining the delay or need for extension but just advising that he was assigned, Mr. Schifferle requested an extension to December 11. I didn't consent because as a physically disabled person, I had to flip over backwards to meet my deadline and certainly made sure to explain (I even attached ER discharge information to prove that I had been physically incapacitated more so than was already the case) and here I was just being pushed aside to let DC Government employees stride by. It would have taken 5 minutes for a paralegal or even a secretary to file a motion to extend by November 6. I don't have computer with internet at home so it's not as good an idea to file that on a table as it doesn't always work like a computer, and so I have to physically go to the Courthouse and file and get a stamped copy as proof. All they had to do was electronically file it right from their offices, and they would have gotten additional time by virtue of filing that alone and waiting for the Court to make a decision about it. And I would have consented if they had explained it instead of just notified me there was a new assignment as though they weren't required to explain it while I had to have a good reason in the lower courts and still didn't receive consent. True, OAG treated my first request well, but I explained the reason to them and to the court about the need, and the need was physical incapacity to do even simple things for myself let alone write and file a document. I wasn't happy with the document I filed but I abided by the deadline because I already got one extension. Later, OAG explains that they basically hadn't kept track of the due date because they were busy. They could have explained this to me but didn't, they only notified me that there was a change in assignment and said nothing about the 3 days that passed and why when it would have taken literally 5 minutes to file an extension request. I was so busy I never really kept up with what I otherwise would have, plus I have a physical disability, but I didn't get the impression that mattered. And yet here, they were just too busy although they're not alone in working it, are lawyers, have staff and copying and other equipment at their disposal. If they spent part of the time they do insuring that DC employees suffered some kind of personal consequence for improper actions, they wouldn't need to spend all this time defending them. They didn't file anything for three days after it was due, didn't explain until I didn't consent and they had to plead with the Court to be able to file anyway (only then did I learn the explanation), and they filed an additional motion to extend on December 11 to be able to file on December 21 2017 ultimately. Their response to my opening brief was filed. I had to file a few documents in that interim, oppositions or whatever, and because it was the holidays, my physical disability never leaving me, I had a filing due December 26 and another a day or so later. And after finishing the December 26, I was exhausted beyond my ability to even just check a calendar and needed to rest and I too late realized that one of these papers I had overlooked to file. I called to find out what to do about it, and was told that I could file it but had to file a motion to file it. My filing was not automatically filed like the December 21 2017 filing of the OAG that I had not consented to. And I contacted OAG and explained and received consent to file it late from the OAG. It was an almost futile

filing because the OAG wanted to consolidate cases and I didn't want to and I figured it would probably go as the OAG wanted rather than what I opposed and filed, but I filed it anyway because I wanted to see if my paper was automatically filed and with consent while OAG's was automatically filed without consent or the ruling of the court. And in fact, my document was lodged only, not filed, automatically. OAG's December 21 response could have been lodged too because it had no consent nor had DCCA granted OAG's two motion for extension. But my paperwork was lodged only until the motion to file late was decided. So there is an automatic deference to DC employees by DC Courts, who are also DC employees, I believe.

DCCA ultimately issued a judgment dismissing these 4 cases based on the technicalities that existed before I even made an opening brief or its response by OAG, seemingly. However that came about that, it was dismissed. And my petition is because the technicalities are not a defense and should not be substituted as a justification when the matter is a grave one. I was having lacunar strokes then and continue to do so now, and having to deal with the issues of this FEMS problem could bring on the symptoms, for which I had to either stop, pop aspirins, and wait for the symptoms to resolve, or go to the hospital. Sometimes I did the latter, but because of the frequency, I also did the former quite a bit because if you don't have a full blown stroke, that's all they do for you is thin your blood and collect 3 days hospital stay from Medicare.

In the 3 cases that are the crux of this writ, Plaintiff requested audios from OUC which proved that the ambulance and medical information in the ambulance medical record were falsified, that the ambulance call was over stroke-like symptoms however before the EMT arrived at my house to get his so-called "impression" it was already falsely documented against me as though I had not called to get help for a stroke but rather having mental issues invented by the EMT and Call taker before him, both of whom should not have known me from a hole in the wall, but a lot of the police knew me. One of the released audios was altogether tampered when I and the 911 respondent were discussing having Tolland Butler, the EMT, arrested. If I had known the information on the EMT's record was already recorded falsely by the Call Taker, I would have said something sooner about that too, but I didn't know yet, but FEMS had all this information at their disposal and knew all these facts and still went with the EMT's so-called "impression" knowing that it was formulated prior to him even arriving at my home to even see me, and in spite of Alert1 alleging stroke-like symptoms as the reason for the ambulance call. Not all audios corresponding to my own recordings were released.

I no longer use ambulances where I or a medic alert person would be calling on my behalf and certainly not in SE, where this occurred. I had a kidney emergency recently, I called for a cab, not an ambulance, and because the cab had to come to SE and they don't like coming to SE because it's dangerous, I waited from about midnight to 5 or so in the morning when a cab finally accepted the job... but I did not call an ambulance, NO WAY. I am deprived therefore of my rights to use public facilities because ambulances, FEMS, are a federal agency, and they have a record pertaining to me that is falsified and can place me in danger again.

Then there were the definitions that were finally provided but turned out to be just more deception and falsification, deliberately falsified. The most glaring of these falsifications was that the falsified mental invention by the EMT was not translated but some other ePCR that had no relation to this was translated instead and only in that area where the EMT falsified a mental issue in place of the stroke-like symptoms reported. I also learned that I told the EMT he could not charge me or Medicare for the ambulance run and to insure that, didn't sign his form to assign benefits, I didn't mention he couldn't use Medicaid because actually I have QMB, which requires Medicare to be accessed first so that Medicaid can pay the portion Medicare didn't -- if Medicare pays nothing then Medicaid also pays nothing also. They didn't file a Medicare claim at all, but a Medicaid claim only. The purpose of doing all this was to discredit me in the first place but if I don't assign benefits to them, they can't put their inventions on record to be associated with my SSN. So they filed a fraudulent Medicaid claim while avoiding Medicare, I get Medicare EoBs, but not Medicaid, so only through the definitions did I learn about the false Medicaid claim, which was necessary because they had to put that sensitive information correlated to my SSN somewhere given the entire purpose of doing this was to document an invented false diagnosis that discredits the validity of my federal complaint. This is when I realized that when I called to get the EMT arrested, I was told I had to wait for FEMS to make that call of whether to have him arrested based on protocol, but now I could see there was no protocol to justify the EMT's decision to take me to the hospital without my permission especially given that at UMC where he took me without telling me that I would be taken there anyway even though I just made a loooooonnnnng explanation of how I needed to go to another hospital that was certified for stroke treatment and UMC didn't have that, at UMC I was told to go sit with the walk-ins and wait my turn and go register myself. And I instead went to the phone and called a cab. There was nothing that would have required the EMT to take anyone to the hospital even against their will in such a scenario, even if his impression was accurate rather than invented, he didn't document that I was dangerous to myself or others so why take me to the hospital where I said I didn't want to go and not tell me that's where we're going anyway so I can decline? I realized with the definitions that there was no protocol taken into account, only protecting the EMT and everyone else involved in this scheme, and insuring the invented diagnosis was

on record somewhere because I didn't register myself but left the hospital. And although the entire matter was intended to falsify, the fact that he didn't further falsify that I was dangerous or something of that nature speaks volumes to the fact that the EMT is an incompetent putting in question his ability to get an accurate "impression" of anything, but also that he expected to get away with doing something so glaring that he could be careless.

P SONS FOR GRANTING THE PET ON

People can die directly from this treatment, or they can be caused to die, if these DC Government employees are permitted to not only do wrong, but know they will get away with it, and to insure that all the more, they do what's necessary to protect each other with stonewalling and other dishonest behaviors. Just because the laws have permitted this up until now, even if there's no precedent for doing differently, it still should be changed.

I myself could have died because I was having stroke-like symptoms. Because the EMT was apparently already instructed to diagnose me otherwise, not only could I have died because of this fraudulent diagnosis but if I passed out, I would not have been able to tell anyone the reason I called an ambulance but rather the medical professionals would have had to figure it out once getting past his ridiculous diagnosis.

I tried to get the EMT arrested (before I realized that the Call Taker had already falsely documented the condition reported by the Alert 1 people, when I learned about this, I realized that the MPD were probably the ones who were really behind all this in retaliation for my having proof of allegations they did not want to take a report for because of "deference" to the subjects of my complaints) and the audio where I discussed the arrest with an MPD rep got tampered, not at the beginning, not at the end of the audio, but smack in the middle.

This is EXTREMELY dangerous for any citizen that any of these persons who carried any of this out are still working for the DC Government in whatever capacities. Petitioner still gets lacunar strokes. Petitioner had to deal with ongoing lacunar strokes when she attempted to treat with the DC employees involved and responsible for responding who then stonewalled her until she filed federal complaints, including with HHS/OCR who forced them to respond, and then they still lied and manipulated so that she filed lawsuits. The matter has not been resolved. Petitioner cannot call 911 for any reason with goons who are going to be responding because if they do something wrong, seriously wrong like is the case here, all they care about is protecting themselves. And they are so arrogant and free of concern, that they don't even care that they lies and responses are full of holes. The discrediting diagnosis had been decided upon by someone BEFORE the ambulance arrived, at the point when the OUC operator took down the information that doesn't even remotely resemble what Alert1 reported.

The Alert 1 chronology AND the OUC audio for April 1, 2013 show stroke like symptoms while the OUC chron & the medical record shows mental issue inserted amid nonsense, omitting stroke like symptoms *AMM*

You have before you in the Appendices the Alert1 chronology of that call, what was reported, and the OUC version, they're unrecognizable. Also the OUC audio *AMM* shows that Alert1 reported stroke-like symptoms yet the OUC chronology is unrecognizable. Then, when Petitioner requested a copy of the OUC audio for her trying to get the EMT arrested, it had clearly been tampered, 6 minutes missing in the middle of the tape. No one in their right mind would call 911 to get help or make a report because these employees, when they want to be, are seriously dangerous people, violent, dishonest, you name it. Why would anyone dial 911 so they can wind up with a criminal with a private agenda at their door. Not fixing this is not fixing an extremely dangerous situation, it doesn't matter if a statute of limitations has truly elapsed, or that there is a public duty doctrine, and so forth. Those are things that need to change so that someone experiencing mini strokes doesn't have to have a stroke to just get the papers done in time, after being stonewalled so that she can't even find out there is such a requirement. *AMM*

To sue which will become another step in a process meant to protect DC emps.

I DO NOT CALL 911 FOR ANY REASON, NOT FOR AN AMBULANCE, AND DEFINITELY NOT FOR THE POLICE. I HAD TO PAY THE FEE ON THE PHONE I DIALED 911 SINCE I READ WHAT THE PAPERWORK SAID, INDEED, FROM JUNE OF 2013, BECAUSE THE 16-4292 CASE IS AGAINST MPD DIRECTLY BECAUSE AFTER PRESENTING THEM ALL SORTS OF EVIDENCE FOR HACKING MY PHONE, MPD

SUDDENLY WANTED MORE INFORMATION STATING THAT THE HACKER DIDN'T EXIST WHEN THEY THEMSELVES HAD CALLED HIM, AND I EMAILED A PICTURE OF THE HACKER AND A CAR HE TRIED TO SELL ME. THE RESPONSE WAS TO SEND A SOCIAL WORKER TO MY HOUSE INSTEAD OF TAKING EVIDENCE AND PROSECUTING. I FILED FEDERAL COMPLAINT AGAINST MPD AND THEY WERE RETALIATING, AMONG OTHER THINGS, BESIDES THE APRIL 1 2013 AMBULANCE CALL DIDN'T RESULT IN HAVING ME COMMITTED OR EVEN TREATED FOR ANY MENTAL ISSUE SO THEY HAD TO TRY AGAIN VIA ANOTHER ANGLE. *In the meantime I'm deprived of a service I need. I'm sure I'm not the only one, that's a reason to grant this writ.*

AMG
gmk

That is reason to grant the petition because this behavior is life-threatening first, and harmful otherwise as well. One needs to sit and think through all the possible harm that can come to a person as a result of persons like these DC employees using their authority and position to harm another human being, otherwise being violent and dishonest on paper, audio tape and whatever is necessary that they are competent to carry out. And, if they're incompetent, which they are incompetent in a way that doesn't camouflage the malice intended, then they carry it out incompetently as well because they're clearly not concerned about having glaring holes and blatant lies in their stories and documentation for the lack of consequence. *And all my exhibits point to a matter of course pattern over many years of DC employees carrying out a private agenda in lieu of their jobs.*

For instance, what if the stroke-like symptoms hadn't resolved but actually got worse. Let's say, I went unconscious in lieu of being awake. And the EMT and OUC operator documented mental issues before ever even seeing me or arriving at my residence and so I was unconscious and in the psych ward unable to speak and explain. And if I was able to, I had to wait until someone was listening because they had a diagnosis that basically labels people so that no one listens to them - a convenient thing to have when the person has filed federal complaint against the police department, that no one listens to them. You don't have to kill such a person, you can just label them insane and thereafter never have to worry about what they say again. Without the label, people will look at evidence such as what I submitted to the MPD against the hacker, but with the label, people have to have a reason to investigate further to wind up realizing that the proof is not just the ranting of an insane person but actually true. If I had passed out and the EMT had been able to do what he wanted (and there are police officers stationed at UMC to help along), then I could have died of a stroke too right then and there because they ignored collectively and with authority what I reported and went with their own private agenda diagnosis. Even if I could not even start to guess at what the reason would be for falsely documenting mental issues instead of reported stroke issues prior to even arriving at the residence, to do this is a private agenda that requires investigation. But not even for the integrity that is supposed to be in their own departments will they ever investigate because the more one digs here, the more refuse and stench one is going to find. *Obeying violations such as these scream for granting this writ*

gmk

It is extremely dangerous to not take action, to not grant this petition, and not just for Petitioner but others too. See the Oberly article I have attached to the DCCA appeals filing of September 17 2018 as Exhibit 3, wherein the judge reviewing a case where a person was refused by FEMS to be taken to a hospital while having a stroke comments on how unthinkable the danger would be being left at the mercy of such employees and yet she couldn't make a decision that was right because of precedent and laws protecting the DC employees, the public duty doctrine, even though their actions endangered and/or harmed the person, i.e., they wouldn't take her to the hospital although she had suffered a stroke. To quote Oberly, "With the holding the majority reaches today, it is clear that the pendulum has swung too far in favor of the District, leaving its citizens at its mercy to provide competent emergency services, without redress when those services are the proximate cause of a tragic result." *And, even worse when carried out w/ malice*

Just as was the case when Justice Warren who disregarded precedent laws (separate but equal) that actually were discriminating against blacks, marginalizing them to the point of reckless endangerment, plus they were pursued and brutalized with no consequence to the brutalizer except if someone made a case for their property being destroyed with the black person being the "property", *this writ should be granted so the law can be fixed to ensure justice.*

It is the government (even if laws changed, it didn't necessarily change the behavior) that took its time in freeing the slaves, deciding after these people were kidnapped from their homeland that they are not entitled to citizenship even if born here, and then ill-used too when enslaved and thereafter endured discrimination and more brutality for daring to exercise rights, etc. The changes were slow and the violence against improvement was such that people were afraid to ask for what might be perceived as too much although it was nothing more than equal to what other citizens had. The government enabled and permitted this, even maintained it to accommodate certain whites, for a very long, long time because of the corruption and misconduct supporting the apparent racial hatred.

The government here protects its employees, the employees protect each other, and they ill-use and thwart the hapless soul that is wronged by them. If this petition is not granted, if DC is not made to correct all that was done here, and I'm not talking about paying the punitive damages, etc., I'm talking about arresting the EMT and all those who conspired together to protect each other and themselves. I'm talking about correcting my record, withdrawing the Medicaid claim they never had permission to make. I'm talking about getting correct definitions that don't contain further invention and manipulation and deception so I can try to correct my record intelligently. If not, I may find myself one day facing the consequences of that record. I may die without help because I won't call an ambulance because there are predators at the DC government, at the MPD, FEMS, OUC, who are lying in wait for such a weak moment to do the harm that will get them out from under a federal complaint I filed that exposed them *in the first Retaliation of that sort is a federal offense but done w/ impunity so the writ should be granted*

And this is not anything new. There were reasons for complaints, and there was deception and fraud all along, DC employees covering for themselves and co-workers, and it's a known joke. I have attached some exhibits that are old however it shows the unchanging modus operandi, the obstinate intent to deceive and maneuver, and that the matter of this writ is merely a more recent issue. As with the abuse of children by priests, at some point someone has to treat it as it should be treated, change the laws so that can be allowed if necessary, but put an end to the abuse of discretion and authority. And not just because it's wrong not to address it for an actual moral change but because it can kill me and others too, some people may not have survived to do a writ.

The Appendix D and Appendix G exhibits are proof upon proof repeatedly and over the years of FEMS, MPD, OUC collectively lying to cover for each other, even with transparent stupid lies, that spoke volumes to the fact that they were immune from real consequences and never changed the fact that whatever they felt they needed to do, including falsifying, they did, and as often as necessary, and not carefully either because they are assured of no real consequences. It's so general that it's clearly how they operate, so the laws protecting them need to change to something more honest and reasonable taking into account citizens that these people harm, sometimes deliberately and with malice. There's no accountability for ineptitude, but also misconduct. Tampering a 911 audio? Really? You know the effort it takes to go find that audio and then edit it to something self-serving? It can't happen by accident. No one does anything? Not with follow-up, not with complaint, not with a lawsuit and appeals, their hands are tied? Or it's just too convenient to keep things the way they are. Refusal to release all the requested audios? That also went unaddressed. All this information through the hands of so many people, there's not one mandated reporter who can't be silenced or bought, there's not one person who blows the whistle or expresses any kind of concern, if not for the victim, for themselves being associated with co-workers who behave arbitrarily and self-servingly and dishonestly and even

violently without concern for anyone but themselves, and they're not even careful about it because they don't have to be, they can do it. They can commit falsely and tell glaring lies with unavoidable holes because all they have to do is get past some person who managed to survive their ill-use and is being stonewalled so nothing gets through their barrier of lies and collective collusion. My exhibits are appalling and individually and collectively paint a picture that these employees are dangerous by their direct actions but also because of the immunity and power they have, and whatever law that protects them that permits them to behave this way should be amended because the exhibits are so atrociously appalling. And conspiratorial too, but they are getting away with it because no one is going to look at the obvious and demand an investigation because it's not going to change anything anyway because it's in their best interest to not change anything. At some point Justice Warren, in spite of precedent and outrageous laws, did change the separate but equal (equal was a joke anyone with eyes in their head could see) to something fair and righteous even though for years those for separate but equal and just generally racists who carried out their racism overtly, had gotten their way because they had gone through enough when their ancestors had to give up their slaves after the Civil War. The fact that this gravely harmed the black population was something that could wait addressing because these racists were accustomed to their way of life and the danger the blacks were in had to accommodate this until the racists were able to accept the new status of blacks, which time would never really come if not forced. It's time, with all this evidence, that DC employees are discomfited by reality and justice and learn to act with integrity and responsibility because consequences need to be a reality and respect for the public whom they are supposed to serve should come first. Even though HHS put an end to the stonewalling, Tina Curtis and Angela Washington at FEMS still stonewalled me by contacting me and trying to make me do what would make their record look alright with manipulation, lies, violation of my rights, gaslighting me so their record looks like they do all that self-serving manipulation, lies, violation of my right, gaslighting, etc. I never got what I needed from them to be able to proceed, but what they did send revealed more fraud and more fraud, it revealed that there never was a protocol that justified the EMT's actions or the OUC call taker because if there had been, they wouldn't have needed to do all that lying and manipulation and stonewalling and violation of my rights and so forth because all they needed to do was tell me which protocol the OUC call taker and the EMT were following. All the exhibits after the April 1 2013 audio and chronology, show how they just heaped more dishonesty upon dishonesty. When they finally released the definitions, not only was it sent by email without asking me how I wanted it first, not only was it not even passworded, but it contained information from another ambulance run that I didn't request in place of the problematic information in the April 1 2013 chronology and ePCR, side-stepping giving me the definitions for the very issues for which I requested them, so the definitions were a waste of time except to expose Medicaid fraud they committed and believe that they never had a protocol that supported the actions of the OUC/FEMS employees, but rather that they just protected them and insured the purpose for which the behaviors of April 1 2013 were done for, exposing that the MPD were behind it, and more proof of that, the MPD audio where I tried to get the EMT arrested was tampered. They still stonewalled me by wasting my time with conversation and self-serving requirements that they knew would never lead to anything except what they wanted, to be able to close their file and keep on record their falsifications that protected the EMT, the OUC operator, the MPD and all the rest of them. That's all that mattered. That has to change by law because it endangers the public and blatantly bald-faced malice. And it's not just my testimony, it's not just paper exhibits, it's audio that I uploaded to YouTube and hear for yourself.

Appendix E exhibits also show the falsifications and ill-use (and I haven't produced all the exhibits because it's physically impossible for me), but even the few exhibits I've produced here and referenced for this Court to view online from the previous courts are layer upon layer of falsified documents and official audios and intrigue. If I included all, it would be physically impossible for me.

The OPC information, the various exhibits in Appendix E including the YouTube uploads, show in part how the MPD uses agency, Office of Police Complaints, is used and even set up to protect police officers rather than correct misconduct. I filed a complaint against Brian Murphy at MPD, I got a letter from OPC in response that misdated the issue about which I complained by about 5 years (who files a complaint due within 45 days 5 years late?), which event was also not described correctly. Murphy's direct supervisor also took my complaint about Murphy years ago, and then concluded that since I would say thank you in my emails to him, that this meant I was satisfied and ignored my telling him that I did that to be polite and to encourage a proper response, and I hadn't thanked him for anything in particular but rather in advance in the expectation of receiving the proper service. Murphy was given a witness for an incident where a bunch of women came after to beat me up, the witness told me no one at MPD ever contacted her. He also did nothing about my report to him that I hadn't received my bank statements in about 18 months, and other crimes. Brian Murphy contacted me first when he was genuinely doing his job but then was flipped. Years later, I filed yet another complaint against an Officer Wilson and also submitted an audio that Rebecca Beyer at OPC listened to and admitted that Wilson was clearly rude, etc., and should have taken a report. She also incidentally mentioned that he was retiring in a year. I was forced to go to Mediation at OPC, which was a joke and the Mediator and Wilson and his union rep (the other officer didn't show up to the mediation to take up for Wilson) were openly laughing, but I can't tell the content because I was sworn to secrecy ... I can understand that now because if you can't tell, they can behave any way they want and say anything they want. An investigation should have ensued after an unsuccessful mediation, and it should have taken about 3 months. In this case, I had an audio and so a day should have been sufficient to do complete an investigation and produce a report that Wilson refused to give me. ^{for 5 years} OPC waited for Wilson to leave and

then reassigned the case and shortly thereafter advised me that they couldn't do anything because the officer was no longer there. OPC is there to protect officers or are influenced by MPD to handle as they want, or both. *This is a compelling reason ~~not~~ to grant the writ* ^{AMM} ~~AMM~~

To continue, Appendix F, which consists of 2 emails to Captain Matt Smith at the Arlington County Police Department, where I gave him enough information for him to re-open the case the original case that started this entire situation... after I had complained also to the USPS Postal Inspector about obstinate invasion of my mailbox. I lived in Arlington then, and so that was the jurisdiction for the case. There was also unlawful entry into my apartment and harassment and so forth by Trans-General. It was assigned to Det. Charlie Brown who handled the investigation by involving Federal Protective Service, now called Homeland Security, Defense Protective Service, and eventually the FBI too, plus other agencies, and local jurisdictions everywhere I went. Eventually, though, Loverde got involved because priests participated because I guess they ran out of little boys, so everyone received immunity. I filed federal complaint at Justice and thereafter at OIG, they all were eventually flipped, the Catholic Church is powerful. Captain Smith heard me out and re-opened the case, but he too eventually got flipped. *the exhibits show this in detail & is relevant to DC because I eventually moved to DC where employees are immune* I've limited the exhibits because there is a page limit to filing a writ, and even though exhibits don't count against the page limit, the indexing of such exhibits would exceed the page limit alone let alone providing a short statement as to how the exhibits and references show why the petition should be granted. If I were to include everything instead of just a handful of exhibits, the page limit would have to be waived to accept boxes full.

If DC gets stopped from operating as I state & provide detailed exhibits for, DC being the capital, other states & jurisdictions won't expect their garbage to be acceptable in DC's backyard because DC laws change as a result of granting this writ

Everyone has heard of Rodney King and Ferguson and so many incidents that today we have the benefit of smart phones that people use to record such issues, and the incidents are endless and of course the ease with which these incidents happen speaks volumes to a long history of such incidents. There has to be a point at which such incidents are seen for the atrocities they are and by the authorities rather than there being an outcry by citizens and law enforcement eventually being pressured into taking some kind of action, even if just for show to shut people up as sometimes appears to be the case. At some point it has to happen.

Although the examples I briefly present exhibits for here are only the tip of the iceberg and certainly not all I would have to show for the history of police misconduct, abuse of discretion and authority, they do present a history where knowing the full truth can appear to be a nightmare if this is just a brief tip of the iceberg.

I have attached exhibits labeled Appendix E, paper exhibits, and Appendix D, ~~which is the CBA~~ ^{AMT} ~~and a folder labeled~~ Appendix F ^{AMT} containing audios ~~about~~, an Office of Police Complaints issue that illustrates that this is a problem, the abusive use of discretion, that is not only the issue that caused this writ, just a more recent issue, but a show that this type of misconduct and abuse of discretion and fraud has been the case consistently in one way or another all along, whatever it takes. I've only attached a few brief examples, and they're the tip of the iceberg, but somewhere, someone has to enact laws or make decisions that this is going to stop instead of jumping on board and stacking wrongs. It is dangerous to have bad cops, bad employees, and a government where the employees feel such a comradery that it takes precedence over moral ethical behavior. These employees are the ones who have to defend those who have no defense but instead they're predators. Predators. *the writ should be granted to end AMT the danger*

Appendix D is a group of exhibits with audio and paper exhibits that was over a report the MPD avoided taking and the rude treatment from the officer, Eric Wilson, instead of a criminal report. I filed a report with the Office of Police Complaints. The one individual who did her job correctly and told me a report should have been taken not only by Eric Wilson but by the officers who refused to take a report prior to Eric Wilson's misconduct, and she was gone from OPC not long afterward. I was forced to go to mediation even though I had an audio of Eric Wilson's voice and handling, and was told that the reason for the mediation was to cost the complainant at least inconvenience for having filed a complaint – that is what I was able to glean from it and the audio is in ~~E~~ ^{AMT} Appendix E and named 802_0777 Bacon Mediator at MPD. Quite frankly, the contents of the mediation is something I was sworn to silence for, but the Mediator was able to say if a party did not really cooperate in the mediation or "did not make a good faith effort" ^{AMT} ~~it was like~~ ~~refused~~ ~~so case~~ ~~closed~~. Since the Mediator was able to reveal that but was conveniently sworn to secrecy as was everyone else, if anyone wanted to dispute that, they were not permitted to discuss it. Insofar as good faith efforts are concerned, whatever reason we went to mediation, it had nothing to do with a good faith effort by the party who created the need for the mediation that I had to attend when I had a tape of the situation that was indisputable and nothing constructive happened afterward. Fast Forward to the final result. The case had to be wrapped up in about 3 months. About a year later, it hadn't been wrapped up yet and another person was handling. Eric Wilson was a year from retirement when I filed the report and he was permitted to retire and then they closed the case saying they could not prosecute because he was no longer there. By dragging their feet in resolving the case, they permitted Eric Wilson to retire prior to finalizing the case so that he could retire without this complaint issue. I could only get a FOIA once the case was closed but when I filed for a FOIA, the person handling gave me an enormous peek-a-boo type of runaround. Finally I contacted her again and she said she had mailed it but I had never received it. Now she released it to me by email, but she was very concerned when she asked what I planned on doing with that information, as though she didn't want to release it if she didn't like my answer because of what I might do with it. I could tell she didn't want to release it almost a year before because of her deliberately ridiculous behavior was intentioned on wasting my time while she never released the FOIA. 802_0212 audio is the recording of my answering my

door when Eric Wilson showed after the 911 call. I have included some other correspondence, although not everything, it shows enough to describe the situation. I would have submitted much more documentation and proof but it is physically impossible for me to do that and be on time with this writ. I do include the letter stating that Wilson is gone so they can no longer do anything, you will note the date is like a year and a half from the date of the incident. You must file with OPC within 45 days, then it takes some weeks for them to get a report from you and arrange mediation. Thereafter, it should be over within 3 months.

November 2012 to May 2014. Wilson was set to retire within a year of the incident, I was told. *And apparently did w/o the bother of consequences.*

Lt. Brian Murphy never appropriately followed up or responded to my reports, which he was supposed to be handling. There was a group assault situation for which he took information but he never contacted the witness. God forbid they should have evidence at MPD, it's avoided like the plague. He never did anything about the 18 months of no bank statements I told him about or anything else that was also criminal. He did nothing he ever bothered to tell me about. I complained about him to Internal Affairs with no positive result, I was supposed to receive an additional form to appeal Murphy's supervisor Goodwill in protecting him but I never received it even though I followed up.

Judge cannot act to correct these outrageous advantages unless public duty doctrine is no longer applicable but replaced by laws that are [redacted] more equitable. Properly had it right in Woods v DC; calling laws unjust & "Heaven help us!"

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Anna Maria Tolley". The signature is fluid and cursive, with "Anna" and "Maria" on the first line and "Tolley" on the second line.

Date: March 14, May 20 and July 22 2019