

19-5506  
No. \_\_\_\_\_

Supreme Court, U.S.  
FILED

JUL 16 2019

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Darrel R. Fisher — PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

VS.

J. Doe, Director License Div 1997, — RESPONDENT(S)  
Mo. Dept of Revenue

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

United States Court of Appeals, 8th Circuit, St. Louis, Missouri 63102  
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Darrel R. Fisher  
(Your Name)

P.O. Box 1600  
(Address)

Butner, North Carolina 27509 prison address, not  
(City, State, Zip Code) my home address, just where I am  
unlawfully imprisoned

(919) 575-3900 prison phone number, not  
(Phone Number) my home number

ORIGINAL

### QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

Can a federal court's judge just make-up his own rules that implementation of violate civil, constitutional and all legal rights and privileges protected by the laws of the United States, without incurring liability to the one's he injured so corruptly?

Will you people back-up your ruling in Oct. 21, 1991 *Mireles v Waco* 502US9112Sct286 116Led2d39, where you defined the conditions under which a judge can be sued for civil damages for his non-judicial acts as without any jurisdiction to actjudicially or after a judge you people protect, from liability to the one's he hurt illegally?

Where in the Constitution is the provision that denies application of the 14th Amendment's Equal Protection clause and the Civil Rights Act of 1856, 42USC1931, clause "to sue, be parties, give evidence" as it applies to every person deprived by any person of any right or privilege secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States as this clause includes the deprivors, the judges you-all protect as it applies against you also?

Will the SCOTUS uphold your own opinion in March 7, 1859 *Ableman v Booth* 21How506 16Led169; March 22, 1922 *Ponzi v Fessenden* 258US254, 261 42Sct309 66Led507, 611, "the court that first acquires jurisdiction holds it to the exclusion of all others, until it has exhausted it's authority over the possession of the person or property, or until it's judgment is satisfied?"

Can a federal judge, at will, amend terms of a civil suit from 42USC1985 via 28USC1343, to a 42USC1983 suit in order to claim the ability to dismiss it after I questioned his integrity and honesty in writing per my right?

## 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:

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED .....	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....	4
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT.....	13
CONCLUSION.....	29

## INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A U.S. Court of Appeals, 8th Circuit opinion

APPENDIX B U.S. Dist. Court, U.D. Mo. WD opinion

APPENDIX C U.S. Court of Appeals, 8th Circuit rehearing

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
Ableman v Booth March 7, 1859 21How506 16Led169	8
Alden v Maine June 23, 1999 527US706 119Sct2240 144Led2d636	2
Armco, Inc. v Penrod-Stauffer Bldg. Sys. Inc. CA4VA May 10, 1984 733F2d1087.2	2
Boyd v US Feb. 1, 1886 116US616,635 29Led740	2,8
Cooke v US April 13, 1925 267US567 45Sct390 69Led767	7
EX PARTE Young March 23, 1908 209US123 28Sct44 52Led714	1
Galpin v Page May 4, 1874 85US350,369 21Led959,964	1
Gooch v US March 23, 1936 297US124,127 56Sct395 80Led522	3,6
Greene v McElroy June 29, 1959 360US474 79Sct1400 3Led2d1377	2,6,8
In Re Pacific Rwy. Comm. Aug. 29, 1887 NDCAL 32FedRep241	2
Jones v SEC April 6, 1936 298US1 56Sct654 80Led1015	1,8
Malone v Bowdoin May 14, 1963 365US643 82Sct980 8Led2d168	2
Meyer v Nebraska June 4, 1923 262US390 43Sct625 67Led2d1042,1045	1
Pappassan v Allain July 1, 1986 478US265 106Sct2932 92Led2d209	2
Slaughter-house Cases April 14, 1873 83US36-130 21Led394,396,397	1
Terry v Ohio June 10, 1968 392US1,11 88Sct868 20Led2d889	6
Windsor v McVeigh Dec. 11, 1876 93US274 23Led914	2

### STATUTES AND RULES

Title 18USC1512(c)(3)(4) Witness Tampering	7
Title 18USC1513 Retaliation Against a Witness, Victim or Informant	7
Title 18USC1951 Racketeering Hobbs Act	5
Title 18USC1952 Travel Act	5
Title 42USC1981 Equal Rights of Citizens	6

### OTHER

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

**OPINIONS BELOW**

☒ For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix 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 United States district court appears at Appendix B to the petition and is

[ ] reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
[ ] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
[ ] is unpublished. ?

[ ] For cases from **state courts**:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_ to the petition and is

[ ] reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
[ ] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
[ ] is unpublished.

The opinion of the \_\_\_\_\_ court appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_ to the petition and is

[ ] reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
[ ] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
[ ] is unpublished.

## JURISDICTION

☒ For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was February 8, 2019.

☐ No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

☒ A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: April 18, 2019, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix C.

☐ 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).

*U.S. Court of Appeals denying rehearing April 18, 2019*

☐ For cases from **state courts**:

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

☐ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: \_\_\_\_\_, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including \_\_\_\_\_ (date) on \_\_\_\_\_ (date) in Application No. A.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).

# CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Art.1, §19.2 cl.2 Habeas Corpus	8 SC
Amendment 4 Probable cause	8 SC
Amendment 5	2,4,5,6 SC
Amendment 4	6 SC
Amendment 5 Double Jeopardy	3,4,5,6,8 SC
Amendment 6	4 SC
Amendment 6 Informed of the nature and cause of the accusation	7 SC
Amendment 14	1,4,5 SC
Amendment 14 Due Process of law	4,5,6,8 SC
Amendment 14 Equal Protection of the laws	4,6 SC
Amendment 14 Property/contract terms	1,2,4,5,6,8 SC



### STATEMENT OF THE CASE

In 1986 Congress made the CMVSA to create the CDL, and by doing so did knowingly violate their own laws and the 5th and 14th Amendments, property, liberty, due process and Equal Protection of the laws clauses and 42 USC 1981, 1982 et al. by writing an act repugnant to the Constitution. They illegally delegated authority to the State's licensing agencies, bureau's offices and commissions the "ability" to discriminate against only truck drivers of some trucks, to require illegal licenses to keep or get a position in one's chosen profession, truck driving, as to violate the terms of 42 USC 1981 "like..licenses..of every kind and to no other." so by unleashing these terms on the States, and giving these governmental bodies the "power" to issue and revoke these CDL's on knowing violations of laws on contracts by cops who falsified their records and documents to assess "points-on-licenses" to delegate "authority" to that agency, bureau, office or commission the power to do that revocation without due process of law of licenses in the courts of the states.

Neither Congress nor the President can authorize any "taking" of property without any due process of law nor without "just compensation" for the "taking" of that property so taken. 1959 *Greene v McElroy*. Congress cannot delegate rule-making authority nor of regulations enforcing laws. That would be unconstitutional from the beginning.

When an agency of the government is given a regulation under its authority to enforce by its inherent responsibility it cannot expand nor in any way enlarge the scope of that regulation, nor can it ignore the limitations in that power to enforce it.

1803 *Marbury v Madison* 1 Cranch 137, 177 1 Led 60 unlike the Constitution, a legislative Act "is alterable when the legislature decides to amend it."

This is a Breach of Contract suit for damages against the Secretary of the US DOT of 1997 and prior years in his/her capacity as the SEC. USDOT and in his/her capacity as a citizen, personally, as a citizen of the United States of America. I, petitioner, seek damages of the restoration of my good name as your negligence to uphold my constitutionally guaranteed contract terms as you are liable to all persons like me whose money you took, property, up front, before I implemented the terms of that contract you guaranteed the enforcement of in the courts of the United States as written of in the 5th Amendment to the Constitution for the United States and several laws..made in pursuance, thereof, as 42 USC 1981, 1982; 18 USC 2, 3, 4, 241, 242, 371, 1201, 1503, 1512, 1513, 1621, 1622, 1623, 1951, 1952, 1961, 1962 et al; and many other criminal laws applicable here for several millions of victims in all 50 states your conspiratorial acts victimi

zed for over 45 years or more, now, before 1997 and 1999 especially noted; and money civil liability under the laws you are liable for paying funds to each and all the one's you defrauded out of their money as "paying" motor fuel taxes up front you as the Sec. USDOT, controlled the distribution of to the states and to the individuals you "paid" that entrusted money by corrupting the very ones you paid to commit a crime or defraud the United States per "laws of the United States;" at a rate of \$5.00 per accusation served as a "traffic ticket" issued by your paid conspirators as defined as 2 or more persons enter into a common enterprise or adventure and a criminal offense is contemplated, they are each a conspirator, as you knew or should have known that dealing with weak minded people, that the incentives you people offered would be used by those one's you are paying to lie, would lie and make a profit from it by your paying for those lies, that that would promote criminal acts by the cops whose weak minds could be exploited easily by you people offering that money, easy to get and keep, that you people collected to use to maintain our Public ROW from us the American citizens and others in this country as HUT money, as your paid help, the cops, especially targeted truckers for those "tickets" to pay out of our federal HUT funds which we did not authorize to use that way.

You committed fraud by claiming the motor fuel tax would be allocated to all the states via IFTA's formula and that money taken would be paid-out to maintain in our Public ROW, not siphoned off millions at a time to deny us motorists our contract/property rights by your theft of our money we earned, you did not.

Your criminal acts of paying cops to deny us our 5th Amendment's "liberty" and "property" rights without due process of law by the force of the gun not due process, was/is tantamount to and is "contract murder for hire" as the pigs kill anyone and everyone every year on this nation's highways all because you people pay them incentives to do that murder to terrorize all Americans by the Communist News Media glorifying those killings by cops as heroes on local news shows as claiming that victim is a suspect did something wrong to justify murdering him so that he deserved death by gunshot.

Nov. 18, 1986 Brown II v Baltimore & Ohio RR. Co. CA4MD 805F3d1133 If the actor's conduct is a substantial factor in bringing harm to another, the fact that the actor neither foresaw nor should have foreseen the extent of the harm or the manner in which it occurred does not prevent him from being liable.

Assuming a duty and its breach, the determination of proximate cause, also an essential element in negligence, is subject to considerations of fairness and social policy as well as mere causation. In the context of third party criminal activity, those considerations dictate that the breach of duty by the defendant

should not result in ~~that~~ liability UNLESS the breach enhanced the likelihood of the particular activity which occurred.

May 20, 1992 Patterson v McLean Credit Union as corrected: 1992 USDISTLEXIS23 (Scalia) [Retroactivity] is contrary to fundamental notions of justice and thus contrary to realistic assessment of probable legislative intent. The principle that the legal effect of conduct should ordinarily be assessed under the laws that existed when the conduct took place has timeless and universal human appeal. The GREEKS, ROMANS, AND ENGLISH COMMON LAW, THE NAPOLEANIC CODE AND THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION all recognized that premise.

Art. IV, § 1: Full faith and credit shall be given in each State to the Public Acts, Records, and judicial Proceedings of each other State.

§ 2: The Citizens of each State shall be entitled to all Privileges and Immunities of Citizens in the several States

Amendment 1: Congress shall make no laws..prohibiting..the right of the people ..to petition the Government for the redress of grievances.

Art. 1, § 10, cl. 1: No State shall..pass any..law impairing the obligation of contracts.

cl. 3: No State shall..without the Consent of Congress..enter into any Agreement or Compact with another State.

Amendment 14, § 1: No State shall make or enforce any laws which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the Equal Protection of the laws.

April 6, 1903 The Spanish Smack Paquete Habana (the Habana) 189US453 23Sct593 47Led900,901,903 at 189US465; The court is of the opinion that the United States had submitted itself to the jurisdiction of the court by its acting as plaintiff against the property.

April 14, 1873 Slaughter-house cases 83US36-130 21Led394,396,397 contract to labor is a right, which right is property. These rights are not political but are civil rights. They include the protection to life, personal freedom, property, religion and reputation.

No State can command its officers to violate the laws. The State acts through its Legislative, Executive and Judicial branches, it can act in no other way. Here, the federal government commanded, counselled, induced, procured, aided and abetted the States as principals, to violate the Constitution's prohibition on obligation of contracts clause in Art.1, § 10, cl.1; cl. 3, compacts clause; Art, 4, § 1; to use facilities in interstate commerce in furtherance of any unlawful act, to violate the "limb" clause in Amendment 5's prohibition on double jeopardy, after a state's agent had been paid by the USDOT and the USDOJ/LEAA to purposefully and with malicious intent, violate the victim's contract with that state, enforceable in the courts, contracts that state's Dept. of Revenue Transportation, Roads all guarantee the enforcement of in the courts of that State, to hold that state's agents liable for their acts as no state can order its officers to violate the laws nor the Constitution nor any privileges or immunities of citizens of the State nor of the United States even under color of law; If a state officer does commit an act violative of the supreme law of the land, he does so at his own peril as EX PARTE Young March 23, 1908 209US123 28Sct 441 52Led714 n.9 he is stripped of his official character and subject to personal liability for his acts. In this case, the petitioner cites June 2, 1952 Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v Sawyer 393US578 72Sct863 96Led1153 The personal immunity of the President from civil suit does not extend to any subordinate officer of the Executive Branch where they are acting beyond their authority either individually or under color of an unconstitutional Executive or Administrative



jail until it was paid or appear in that Kangaroo court and answer that illegally made "charge" made under duress. All these acts were the result of the federal government's CDL's administration by the state's pigs. 18USC1951 Racketeering; Whoever uses physical force or the threat of physical force, to hinder, delay the communication to a law enforcement officer or a judge of the United States of information relating to the commission of a federal offense..and using physical force to carry-out the federally funded kidnapping by a gun-wielding pig is a federal offense, 18USC1512(b)(3)(ii); (a)(3)(C) as above, and (c)(1)(2)(3)(4) in 1997-1999 as written in law then; (e)(1); (f)(2); and then there is 18USC1513 (e), the pigs did knowingly with intent to retaliate, takes any action harmful to any person including interference with the lawful employment or livelihood of any person, for providing to any law enforcement officer any truthful information relating to the commission of a federal offense..because I did report to the federal government's USA in Albuquerque, N.M. March 8, 1997, of the commission of a federal offense, I was forced out of my livelihood and lawful employment by the pigs who were in other states who used interstate commerce facilities to retaliate and did interfere with my lawful employment and livelihood in 1997 especially, and in 1999 where I again, did try to communicate with a federal judge of federal offenses, I was physically injured by the pigs as 1513 (b)(1)(2)(B); (e); (a)(1)(B); (g); all of these aforementioned crimes were used to intimidate me or conspired to be used to do that and carried out to do that; all in retaliation for my objecting to federally funded pigs' acts, 18USC1951(a), whoever in any way or degree obstructs, delays or affects commerce or the movement of any article or commodity in commerce by ROBBERY or EXTORTION, or attempts or conspires to do so; (b). "Robbery" (1).; (2) "extortion"; (3) "Commerce"; The pigs threats to me were distinct and to the point that they were using interstate commerce facilities in furtherance of any unlawful act, 18USC1952 Travel Act and the Hobbs Act was violated by those federally funded pigs and with the full knowledge of the Secretary of the USDOT and the Attorney General of the United States as well as the Director of the LEAA under the USDOJ since 1986. The pigs used fear and intimidation as fear of future injury to my livelihood and lawful employment to coerce me to travel unaccompanied across state lines to "appear" in those Kangaroo courts in California, West Virginia, Texas, New Mexico, Illinois, to defend my good name, reputation, is a civil right, from these pigs' false accusations who were paid \$5.00 for each false accusation made, win, lose or draw in court, out of HUT funds I paid into for many years as another federal offense by the federal government against us, we the people by the very government that made these acts criminal.

I paid the HUT to use all public roads in every state and federal highway per my chosen profession (Vocation) of driving a truck for a living as per the Constitution's "liberty" and "property" clauses in the 5th Amendment per the SCOTUS' interpretation. "Paying" the tax constituted a contract with both that state and the federal government's USDOT which administers the IFTA and the federal government itself conspired with every state to deny me my contract rights (property) by design. The acts of J. Doe of the Missouri Dept. of Revenue, License Division did not obey the Constitution's command first and did conspire with the pigs in several states mentioned above, to interfere with interstate commerce by robbery and extortion in any way or degree using interstate commerce facilities to do it in 1997.

Since the CDL was a federal creation and was by the text of the act of Congress, the Civil Rights Act of 1866 42USC1981, 1982, subject to like..licenses..of every kind and to no other, in the order of enforcement per the SCOTUS' own rulings on that, "in the order Congress wrote the law is the order of enforcement," as "make and enforce contracts" is first and second and licenses is 12th in order of enforcement, as per ruling law when the CMVSA was enacted in 1986 as it contradicts that law..that law made in pursuance, thereof, the Constitution. The pigs were acting pursuant to federal inducements at \$5.00 per "ticket" written win, lose or draw in Kangaroo court, as no court can operate outside its geographical jurisdictional boundaries, and any attempt to do so is "nothing less than lawless violence." March 7, 1859 Ableman v Booth 21How506 16Led169, and since that CDL was a federal license, the action of the state in obeying a federal dictate makes the act a violation of a federal act as it was procured, induced, commanded, counselled, aided and abetted by the principal in the case by two or more in conspiracy as March 23, 1936 Gooch v US as cited above.

This was prearranged by the federal government and ordered to be performed, committed by J. Doe in 1997. The parallels of the Spanish Smack Habana quotation is strikingly useable here, as the property taken was valuable and seized without probable cause and without due process of law and the states, the surrogates of the federal government, did put itself in court as petitioner against that property of mine on an unknown complaint then, as I was never notified of any civil action against my property in 1997 as I was entitled to notice of it before the "hearing on revocation" to afford me time to consult counsel, prepare a defense, consult with witnesses to prepare for a court suit's action.

April 13, 1925 Cooke v US 267US577 45Sct390 69Led767; the very presence of the US Att'y. was itself evidence that the proceeding was criminal, not civil, all

along..as planned to be all along as "taking property" is under the guise of a civil proceeding, but it is really a criminal prosecution not a civil litigation, as to force a man to forfeit his property to the government is in its nature a criminal enterprise or adventure. Feb. 1, 1996 Boyd v US 116uS616,635 6Sct 524 29Led746. The State has no 11th Amendment immunity as it was a federal agent and as so is subject to federal law as a paid conduit to a common criminal conspirator "in any crime." It did use the "passage of a law" to "impair the obligation of contracts" both federal tax paid and state tax paid and a license contract with the state. The "compact" with other states regarding judicial proceedings is a violation of the spirit and intent of the provision in the Constitution as no criminal act can be immune from criminal prosecution where the compact clause only covers legal acts of judicial proceedings, as the federal government cannot recognize the full faith and credit clause as applying it here as crime is rampant in these matters of conspiracy.

I did not get into the 14th Amendment's Due Process of law clause yet, and its prohibition on depriving any person life, liberty or property without it and its application in the States and Equal Protection of the laws for every person within any state's jurisdiction which the federal government ordered the State's to violate against some persons, truck drivers only at first. That is when and how and where the current round of illegalities got started as pigs have been violating citizens rights for many years now by denying Equal Protection of the laws since they began to claim to "arrest" persons for driving on their own property with guns as their choice of methods to accomplish this deed and goal.



## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Declaration by a victim of the congressionally created Illegal CDL! Foundation: We were told by the media, that several states' local government courts were complaining to the other several states' courts about truck drivers with fictitious "driver's licenses" issued by that state but under false names and addresses that did not exist, so that local court could not collect the "fines" levied against those out-of-state truckers who had multiple licenses issued by several different states, and without a "picture" of that person who was the license holder. That is what set up that CDL. MONEY! And the threats to impose illegally, double jeopardy against that person's "license" using interstate commerce facilities in furtherance of any unlawful act, 18USC1952 Travel Act, after the state's local agent cop had violated the law of the United States 18USC1951 Racketeering's exactly worded terms..as regards both commerce and interstate commerce, as these "truckers" were from "out-of-state" so were obviously involved in interstate commerce and as the cops did in any way or degree affect, obstruct or delay by Robbery or Extortion, and using or threatening to use force as conspired to do so or commits or threatens physical violence against the property in one's possession or in one's custody or of members of his family; all these acts used were to create fear by the wrongful use or threatened use of the cops' gun under color of official right. These tactics were used against "truckers" who were either bringing freight into the state for manufacture, distribution or consumption by the consumers in that state as California, e.g., was a major complainer, of carrying the state's produce produced by the people who contracted with interstate carriers to carry the state's produce to other states' markets for a profit to pay the state's taxes on profits made by these sales of the produce out-of-state to buyers there. They employed "truckers" to do it in interstate commerce. NOW, TO a point of law: A. The cop who decided to be acting unlawfully issuing a "ticket" to that motorist using Public ROW was illegally motivated as, (1) the motorist, by the very use of the term motorist, connotes a contractor with the state itself and the federal government as he "paid" HUT to use that Public ROW by the state and federal governments: both collecting taxes on gallons pumped at the pump before exercising those contract terms to use that Public ROW he paid to use both governments guarantee by law to enforce in the courts as the SCOTUS ruled in April 14, 1873 Slaughter-house cases 83US36-130 21Led394,396,397 that contract to labor is a right which right is property and property is a civil right not political in origin, and as the law states, 42USC1981 "right..to..make and enforce contracts" in the courts of the United States and the SCOTUS ruled in May 3, 1948 Shelley v Krae

mer 334US1,10 68Sct834 92Led1161 property; right to acquire, own, enjoy, and dispose of property; and in terms of the law 42USC1982 which states "right..to. purchase, sell, inherit, lease, convey, and hold real and personal property;" as contract terms are property, the cops violated laws on the enforcement of those terms/laws as per the SCOTUS' rulings on those laws. (2) That "ticket" was paid for by the USDOT and USDOJ/LEAA to be issued illegally by the cops' for a profit to them as an inducement they did not turn down, to lie and against those "truckers" from out-of-state especially; B. No cop can issue any summons on the side of the road to appear in some local court unless he signed a civil complaint against a local resident and it must be issued by the court clerk of that local court only and only to local residents who actually reside in that court's jurisdictional boundaries, not to out-of-state "truckers" in the first place as by the very term out-of-state indicates a non-resident of that local court's jurisdictional boundaries. C. The cop first of all conspired to violate the Racketeering law and due process to deny property, then liberty of contract then liberty of movement and interstate travel for all persons equally and Equal Protection of the laws by singling out out-of-state truckers for special targeting to violate their contract rights' terms by threatening all their contract rights by the very presence of the cops on the Public ROW, state roads he did not pay to be on as he was a trespasser on that Public ROW, and a common lawbreaker. D. So no state's complaint to Congress was left unheard as they did make it a forced-on-the-state CDL the State's asked for to violate the contract terms of out-of-state "truckers" under color of official right, and was unlawful in its inception by the State's and Congress' act in 1986. E. There could be no "trial" on that illegal complaint because that victim was never served notice of any civil complaint not by the complainant nor a copy of any complaint nor any court clerk issued summons to appear in civil court locally as the out-of-state trucker did not reside in that court's jurisdictional boundaries so was not served notice as could not be served notice because he was not a local resident within the court's jurisdiction. By the very argument of an out-of-state non-resident indicates by itself that the cop knew of the laws on interstate commerce and non-residents of a court's jurisdiction and of the fact no one but a court clerk can issue any summons to appear in any court for any civil suit anywhere; Therefore Congress violated the laws on Racketeering, Regulations on the Courts and for the government they made. Also terms of that CDL were 1 Double jeopardy for no trial nor any conviction nor litigation settlement. 2. Using a person's SS# for identification as a photograph of the one forced to hold that CDL or else starve to death and die at the whim of a cop.

This started out that just some truck drivers were subject to this invasion of civil rights but it has spread to every walk of life in America since its inception in 1986, and it included a forced drug test for just truck drivers where he was judged guilty until proven not guilty until the next accusation by some unknown accuser of what you never knew until you were denied your rights to confront the witnesses and be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation and to a speedy trial by an impartial jury, never afforded any CDL holder. Thus we were discriminated against under color of official right by the very federal government that guaranteed us our rights could be enforced in the courts of the United States. The use of any person's SS# for identification in violation of his contracted rights with the federal government denies that person his personal property without due process of law but only by the power of intimidation and the use of ultimate force of threatening to kill the one who protests too much as with the forced drug tests, the guilt is assumed before any formal or informal accusation and subsequent trial on the merits of the accusation and the "accused" is guilty before he can prove not guilty until the next accusation where he is again guilty without any due process but the power of the gun. The SCOTUS wrote "In the order Congress wrote the law is the order of enforcement." in 42USC1981, "contracts" are 1st and 2nd while "licenses" is 12th in order of enforcement by the SCOTUS' own ruling on that order. Then the "points-on-licenses" part of the forced CDL package as "double jeopardy" ordered by the CMVSA of 1986 as no "traffic court" is legal in this entire nation as no court clerk summons is issued for a person accused of a minor "traffic offense" which is a civil suit not criminal, as no cop on the street can issue any summons to order an appearance in any court because he is not empowered to act as a court clerk in that capacity. He violates the victim's contract rights by illegally stopping the victim in the first place as he is not only a conspirator in the criminal sense but he does it under color of official right. 18USC242,371 are violated by his acts. The court compounds the illegality by assessing "points-on-licenses" knowingly violating the victim's contract rights by doing so as all things are a contract to do or not do a specific thing. The federal government is bound by the Bill of Rights to not do certain things such as forcibly deny any person his immunity from double jeopardy especially where no offense is alleged nor tried after not being informed of any such offense. Yet, due to the CDL all bets are off when it comes to due process of law, especially for this nation's truckers who move all this country's food stuffs, and will for the foreseeable future.

As I have written of several times to the various courts of the United States, I was enroute to federal court in Albuquerque, New Mexico, when and where I filed criminal charges against a dirty pig, Su, the USDOT and USDOJ each and both did subsidize. The State cannot criminalize any person's act of freely exercising any constitutionally protected, secured right or privilege. SCOTUS. As a result of those subsidies, the pigs systematically violate federal and state guaranteed rights enforceable in the courts of the United States, property rights, contract terms and conditions, as the SCOTUS ruled were such. You people, the SCOTUS, write/ruled many times the Civil Rights Act of 1866 is the law and that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 did not in any way abolish it nor override any provision of it, but did put some teeth in it as enhancing and expanding a few points of the 1866 Act. So, it stands complete. "Make and enforce contracts" is the law. So you people do not uphold what you write of. Because you people consistently rule against the people upholding pigs' acts violative of that law on contracts in the 1866 Civil Rights Act, you are responsible for the atmosphere of fear in America today, of being killed/murdered by a pig who would walk away with \$5.00 to show for the killing, paid to him by the subsidy. Because of repeated violations of the rule of law by the pigs, especially the Civil Rights Act of 1866 and its enforcement under the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the pigs routinely deny us Americans our/my contract terms as rights secured by the Constitution as "property" in the 5th and 14th Amendments, I was forced off my job in my chosen profession the 14th Amendment protects, and the laws condemn as to the pigs threatening my employment and did force me out of my livelihood by their combined acts of perjuring themselves for that \$5.00 bill from the USDOT and USDOJ each. J. Doe, as the laws' rulings, his/their acts were criminal; 18USC241, 242, 371, 1503, 1512, 1513, 1621, 1951, 1952; 42USC1981, 1982, 1985; I never received any notification of any civil suit action against me in 1997 to appear in any state courtroom by a court clerk issued summons to appear and an copy of any civil complaint by any complainant, especially from and by J. Doe of the Mo. Dep't. of Revenue, License Div. in 1997 not before nor since. I never received any notice of any civil complaint from any court clerk in any state where the local pigs denied me my property/contract rights that state guaranteed me the enforcement of, where as a result of the federal government's criminal act in 1936 as the ordering the state's to commit "double jeopardy" against its ordered CDL adoption as to assess points-on-licenses as to order that as a civil offense is as much protected from double jeopardy as criminal suits are prohibited on the same footing per the terms in the 5th Amendment, "life or limb" as the first is loss of liberty while the latter is money/property.

These pigs all acted under color of official right as each knew he was violating the constitutional rights of the victims of each's act per eachone's sworn oath to support the Constitution and all laws made in pursuance, thereof and that included the 14th Amendment's provisions on due process and Equal Protection of the laws then the State's constitution and all legally enforceable laws made there under the guidelines of the 14th Amendment's provisions of Due process and to not deny any person within it's jurisdiction the Equal Protection of the laws. That Amendment also contains a "property" clause that cannot be denied by any act of the state by any pig acting under color of a state law. That is exactly what the federal government ordered the states to do in 1986 was to commit "double jeopardy" against all truck drivers at first by issuing false accusations against them for the \$5.00 bill the USDOT and USDOTJ each paid that pig for his illegal act of denying that trucker his contract/property right as the state did collect the tax per gallon pumped at the time of purchase. state highway use tax at 24¢ per gallon and some even higher per gallon.

That collection of that tax constituted making a contract with that state the Constitution's 14th Amendment prohibits the state from denying the enforcement of in a courtroom. The pigs all deny those out-of-state-truckers the right to use the highways without some sort of search or other harassment, just because one person chose a proud profession and livelihood to support himself and his family.

Feb. 25, 1992(May 6, 1991 listing) US v Snider CA9 Wash 957F2d703 A plea agreement obviously could not authorize a judge to impose whatever punishment the government and the defendant agree to...The government proceeds from the apparent assumption that a criminal defendant's plea agreement is in being governed solely by the dictates of contract law...This is an erroneous assumption. In essence, contract terms instituted in violation of the Constitution and laws made in pursuance thereof, and all the rights and privileges secured by that document, are not enforceable as any lawful terms of any contract; they do constitute a conspiracy to commit a crime or defraud the United States and deprive one of his rights under color of official right. 18USC242,371,1512,1519,1621,1503.

Jan. 3, 1927 Byars v US 273US28 47Sct243 71Led520 a search prosecuted in violation of the federal Constitution is not made lawful by what it brings to light.

Jan. 14, 1963 Wong Sun v US 371US421 83Sct3296 8Led2d441 Knowing crimes by the government's own wrongs cannot be used by it in criminal prosecutions.

June 4, 1928 Olmstead v US 277US433 48Sct520 72Led944 Disseny by Brandeis; To declare that in the administration of the criminal laws, the ends justify the means--to declare that in order to secure the conviction of a private criminal--would bring terrible retribution. Against this pernicious doctrine this court should resolutely set its face.

The CDL was induced, procured, commanded, counselled, aided and abetted by the federal government to be enforceable as a contract because as a contract it proposed violations of the Constitution's 5th Amendment and the 4th's and laws enforcing those "liberty" and "property" concepts as to deny due process of law as in Snider, cited, there was an erroneous assumption that the CDL could be enforced as a contract when its inception was to violate several provisions of the Constitution as due process, double jeopardy, search and seizure, Equal Protection of the laws, et al.

42USC1981,1982; "Make and enforce contracts" as terms are a right which right is property; and the right..to purchase, sell, inherit, lease, convey, hold real and personal property;

May 3, 1948 Shelley v Kraemer 334US1,13 68Sct835 92Led1161,1180 Among the civil rights protected by the 14th Amendment are the rights to acquire, enjoy, own, and dispose of property..n.7 Equal protection of the laws required by the 14th Amendment is not achieved through indiscriminate imposition of inequalities. Making a contract is paying the HUT buying fuel and the state collecting that tax by which that state guarantees the contract's enforcement to use that motor fuel in driving on the highways it was bought to use on.

The states were co-opted into the fraud committed on the United States by Congress in 1936 by the introduction into the "laws" the CMVSA, which violated one contract in favor of violating all the ones already written of and denying truck drivers of their contract terms rights to be secure in property without the government taking those terms for public use without due process of law but by force of either/or the states adopt the CDL or lose the right to fix those federal highways in that state which the HTF paid for as to the users of the motor fuel paid into that fund to insure good roads to drive upon, but the federal government decided to extort from the states their ability to fix those roads that needed fixing. The forced CDL's ramifications were extreme as to trade off the use of trucker's SSN for identification of those CDL's as to deny the truckers their contract rights by decree not due process of law, as the Constitution commands in the 14th and 5th Amendments. Another ramification in the use of the CDL was to allow any cop to search the CDL for a record of an outstanding "ticket" issued illegally by a dirty cop who cannot issue any summons to appear in any local court as he is not a court clerk who is the only one who can issue any summons to appear in a local court if and only if the person lives in that court's jurisdictional boundaries as defined by law. If he does not live there, he cannot ever be served any notice of any civil suit by the court clerk so all those "tickets" the government paid \$5.00 to write are moot in enforcement as no notice was ever served on the person that dirty cop illegally accosted on the public highway the person paid HTF to be on. The love of money by the states is what led Congress to create the CDL in the first place as to make money for the counties and the state in fines illegally assessed. Then there is double jeopardy to contend with. Points-on-licenses is also a side-effect of that CDL's illegal creation by Congress in 1986 as to amass enough points in a certain amount of time was enough to revoke the CDL on those points as illegally issued "tickets" by the mercenary cops all of which were illegal as no due process was employed to issue any summons by a court clerk. Then the CDL was created to use interstate commerce facilities in tracking the use of those CDL's as the cops used radio to search the CDL's record for profit by the cop who was paid the \$5.00 per "ticket" issued no matter win, lose or draw in court. The USDOT and the USDOT both and separately paid the cops those \$5.00 fees per "ticket" written. That led to thousands of drivers being thrown out of their employment and the drug tests were also part of the CDL as it too was not in accord with the Constitution's requirements of due process of law nor Equal Protection of the laws in the states as the 14th Amendment commands.

Supreme Court of the United States  
1 First Street NE  
Washington, D.C. 20543-0001

case #18-2874

Clerk of the Court: Re: Petition for Writ of Certiorari from the 8th Circuit and motion to proceed IN FORMA PAUPERIS and I am proceeding PRO SE.

First: To start this petition, I, petitioner, must remind you-all of a few opinions from the past SCOTUS rulings that especially fit this presentation:

A. March 23, 1908 EX PARTE YOUNG 209US123 28Sct441 52Led714 n.9 where the state violates the Federal Constitution, his act attempting in the name of the state, to enforce a Mandamus, is mainly illegal, because is in conflict with the Supreme authority of the federal Constitution, and is stripped of his official character and the protection against his privilege of immunity, therefore, affect those state's its governmental capacity.

B. April 14, 1873 Slaughter-house cases 83US36-130 21Led394,396,397 The obligation to labor being imperious; confers a right of labor which right is property; and it cannot be withdrawn or destroyed, by arbitrary legislation without the violation of natural right! No state of the American Union can deprive a man of his title by arbitrary edict, and arbitrary institutions to limit, depress, impair or take away this right, cannot be favored nor maintained! The protection to life, personal freedom, property, religion, reputation. Right of labor is right of property! The state is commanded neither to make nor to enforce any law that deprives or even abridges any citizen of his enjoyment of his privileges or immunities. To limit him in the choice of a trade or to deprive him of a business he has pursued and to give others the sole and exclusive right to follow that trade or to prosecute that business, violates this Constitution.

C. Jones v SEC April 6, 1936 298US1 56Sct654 80Led1015 n. 5-6 The action of the commission finds no support in right principle or in law...It violates the cardinal precept upon which the constitutional safeguards of personal liberty rest- that this shall be a government of <sup>laws</sup> ~~laws~~ because to the precise extent that the mere will of an official or an official body is permitted to take the place of official discretion or to supplant the standing law as a rule of human conduct, the government ceases to be one of laws and becomes an autocracy..To escape assumptions of such power on the part of the three primary departments of the government, is not enough. Our institutions must be kept free from the appropriation of unauthorized power by lesser agencies as well. And if the various administrative bureaus and commissions...are permitted gradually to extend their powers by encroachments-even petty encroachments- upon fundamental rights, privileges and immunities of the people, we shall in the end, become submerged by a multitude of minor invasions of personal rights, less destructive but no less violative of constitutional guaranties..Even the shortest step in the direction of curtailing one of these rights must be halted in limine, lest it serve as a precedent for further advances in the same direction or for wrongful invasion of the others.

D. June 4, 1923 Meyer v Nebraska 262US390 43Sct625 67Led1042,1045 n.2 The right to choose and pursue a vocation is within the rights guaranteed by the 14th Amendment.

E. May 4, 1874 Philip Galpin v Lucy Page 85US350,369 21Led959,964 It is a rule as old as the law..that no one shall be personally bound until he has had his day in court, by which is meant, until he has been duly cited to appear and has



been afforded an opportunity to be heard. Judgment without citation and opportunity wants all the attributes of judicial determination. It is judicial usurpation and oppression and never can be upheld where justice is justly administered. Field

F. Dec. 11, 1876 Windsor v McVeigh 93US274, 23Led914 A sentence pronounced against a party without hearing him or giving him an opportunity to be heard, is not a judicial determination of his rights and is not entitled to respect in any other tribunal. Field.

G. May 10, 1984 Armco, Inc. v Penrod-Stauffer Bldg. Sys. Inc. CA4VA 733F21087, 1089 When the process gives the defendant actual notice of the pendency of the action, the rule, in general is entitled to liberal construction. Where there is actual notice every technical violation of the rules or failure of strict compliance may not invalidate service of process. But the rules are to be followed; and plain requirements for the means of effective service of process may not be ignored.

H. Aug. 29, 1887 In Re Pacific Rwy. Commission NDCAL 32fedRep241 The courts are open to the United States as they are to the private citizen, and both can there secure, by regular proceedings, ample protection of all rights and interests which are entitled to protection under a government of a written Constitution and laws.

I. Feb. 1, 1886 Boyd v US 116US616, 635 29Led740 It may be that it is the obnoxious thing in its least repulsive and mildest form; but illegitimate and unconstitutional practices get their first footing in that way, namely; by silent approaches and slight deviations from legal modes of procedure. This can only be obviated by adhering to the rule that constitutional provisions for the security of persons and property should be liberally construed.. Their motto should be **obstra principiis**. We have no doubt that the legislative body is actuated by the same motives; but the vast accumulation of public business brought before it sometimes prevents it, on a first presentation, from noticing objections which become developed by time and the practical application of the objectionable law.

J. July 1, 1986 Pappasan v Allain 478US265 106Sct2932 92Led2d209 a state official is stripped of his capacity when as YOUNG he violates the "supreme law."

K. June 23, 1999 Alden v Maine 527uS706 119Sct2240 144Led2d636

L. May 14, 1962 Malone v Bowdoin 365US643 82Sct980 8Led2d168

M. June 29, 1959 Greene v McElroy 360US474 79Sct1400 3Led2d1377 n.3 The evidence used to prove the government's case, documentation..and..testimony.. must be disclosed to the individual so that he has an opportunity to show it is untrue. n.1. The right to hold specific private employment and follow a chosen profession free from unreasonable governmental interference comes within the "liberty" and "property" concepts of the 5th Amendment. n.2. A private employee who has been discharged from his employment..has standing to bring suit against the responsible government officials and to assert whatever rights he may have, since the defendants actions; directed at the plaintiff as an individual, caused substantial injuries and were the subject of a suit between private persons, could be attacked as an invasion of a legally protected right to be free from arbitrary interference with private contractual relationships, and endows the plaintiff the right to be free from unauthorized actions of government officials which substantially impair his property interests.

n.7. Acquiescence or implied ratification by Congress or the President is not sufficient to show delegation of authority to take action within an area of questionable constitutionality..n. 9. The United States Supreme Court will not, in the context of a security clearance case, determine whether a person may be deprived of the right to follow his chosen profession without full hearing where accusers may be confronted, unless it is clear that the President or Congress, within their constitutional powers, specifically have decided that the imposed procedures are necessary and warranted and have authorized their use.. n. 10. A decision by Congress or the President that a person may be deprived of the right to follow his chosen profession without full hearings where accusers may be confronted cannot be inferred from acquiescence or nonaction.. n. 11. Where administrative action raises serious constitutional problems, the United States Supreme Court assumes that Congress or the President intends to afford those affected by the action the traditional safeguards of due process..n. 12. Traditional forms of fair procedure will not be restricted by implication and without the most explicit action of Congress, even in areas where it is possible the Constitution presents no inhibition.360US507 They must be made explicitly not only to assure that individuals are not deprived of cherished rights under procedures not actually authorized, but also because explicit action, especially in areas of questionable constitutionality, requires careful and explicit action by lawmakers, decisions of great constitutional import and effect would be relegated by default to administrators who, under our system of government, are not endowed with authority to decide them. 360US492 The alleged property is the petitioner's employment; and the alleged liberty is petitioner's freedom to practice his chosen profession...The Board relied on confidential reports which were never made available to the petitioner. Those reports apparently were compilations of statements from various persons contacted by an investigatory agency. Petitioner had no opportunity to confront and question persons whose statements reflected adversely on him or to confront the government investigator who took their statements. Moreover, it seemed evident that the Board itself had never seen those persons whose statements were the subject of their reports...The belief that no safeguard for testing the value of human statements is comparable to that furnished by cross-examination, and conviction that no statements should be used as testimony until it has been probed and sublimated by that test, has found increasing strength in lengthening experience.

March 23, 1936 Gooch v US 297US124,127 56Sct395 80Led522 When by prearrangement, or on the spur of the moment, two or more persons enter into a common enterprise or adventure, and a criminal offense is contemplated, they are each a conspirator. note N.

O. In the order Congress wrote the law is the order of enforcement.

P. The SCOTUS wrote "all acts of all conspirators in any crime;" All acts include the civil liability acts as well as the criminal liability acts each conspirator commits in relation to the overall criminal acts in question.

Second: I, petitioner, believe I have a viable and solid case against J. Doe's acts in 1997 of the License Div. Mo. Dept. of Revenue, because: A. the federal government in 1986 forced all the States to either "adopt" the CDL or the USDOT would forcibly divert 8% of the HUT funds the first year and 12% the next year that State did not "adopt" that CDL and all its ramifications. Of those, one was forced double jeopardy. Meanwhile, the USDOT and the USDOJ/LEAA each and both paid dirty cops in this country each \$5.00 per "ticket" they wrote, no

matter win, lose or draw in court. That \$5.00 mounts up and each dirty cop did not resist that temptation, so that is what the federal government did to bring me to this suit against J. D  e. B. In each of the dirty cop incidents that altogether mounted up to the forced illegal act of J. D  e in 1997 where he/she responsible for the "double jeopardy" induced revokation of that forced CDL where I was never notified of any pending civil suit action by the State of Missouri of any revokation hearing if one was ever scheduled or held? The State's Attorney General cannot be involved in any civil process as the Courts of Appeals, including Missouri in the 8th Circuit, have ruled no "appointed counsel" is allowed to be afforded either the petitioner nor the respondent in any civil suit, where no government agent can have "appointed counsel" no more than any other petitioner in any civil suit; because all courts including the SCOTUS, claim the so-called petty and misdemeanor offenses alleged, are civil in nature not criminal and the 6th Amendment's "counsel" phrase is preceeded by the word CRIMINAL prosecution requirement that does not apply in/to civil suits/actions. How many cases do you want me to cite? 50-100? That is easy.

The SCOTUS has ruled that the phrase in the 5th Amendment "life or limb" means prison (liberty) and "money" and the double jeopardy prohibition applies to both equally whether it is a criminal or civil case. What it boils down to is in the end no government agent can sue any person civilly as petitioner in any court because that entity has to use another government employee acting as "appointed counsel" for that petitioner at public expense. This was done or so I deduced from what happened in 1997, for which I, petitioner, was never notified of any civil suit pending against me in any Missouri court as to be notified by the petitioner in person or his paid process server at my home residence only. This was never done in 1997 by any court clerk issued summons nor any copy of any complaint by that petitioner nor why he/she made it. No other process is allowed by any law per Amendment 14's property clause via the due process of law clause and Equal Protection of the laws clause, but this was not done properly or at all as no agency nor department or commission can be afforded a lawful court's power to take property from a citizen except by judicial act per Amendment 14's due process clause nor can the General Assembly designate powers to any agency of the Executive Branch's Attorney General to act as "appointed counsel" in any civil suit's action to "take" property without just compensation being paid for what was taken legally, but since there was no lawful "taking" no just compensation is due but was seized under color of official right by the Executive Branch's Attorney General's agent J. D  e in 1997.

Only the Legislative branch can institute "taking" property processes by the self-created right of Eminent Domain powers that are not written into the Constitution anywhere I have ever read. The Legislative branch can institute condemnation proceedings in the judicial branch's courts to get real or personal property but not by the Executive branch's instigation of proceedings to acquire that property and even then must pay just compensation for it what was taken. The acquisition of property is a civil suit the government cannot institute at public expense because if that could be done, we would be submerged by a multitude of minor invasions of personal rights by self-serving servants who do not have the legal authority to decide questionable constitutionally insecure acts by themselves as perpetrators in the acts. These acts are being done now herein in the United States by bureaucrats who have gradually encroached upon our constitutional rights, privileges and immunities by slow stealthy encroaching on our very constitutional liberties we take for granted by governmental bodies we did not elect to do so. You wrote that without notice and an opportunity to be heard in a courtroom was judicial usurpation and oppression and could not be allowed where justice is justly administered. That was disregarded by the act of J. Doe under color of official right in 1997. The act by J. Doe was preceded by the federal Government's inducing, procuring, counselling, commanding, aiding and abetting as a principal in the act of forcing the states to all do their bidding in imposing double jeopardy in direct violation of the 14th Amendment enforcing the 5th's prohibition as both require due process to deprive any person of his property as not once was I, this petitioner, ever notified of any pending civil action in any state where I was deprived of my contract, property rights by those subsidized cops who falsified any record or document in order to make that \$5.00 per "ticket" written, which all in all led to the act of J. Doe in arbitrarily "revoking" my forcibly held CDL on Dec. 7, 1997 under a cloud of suspicious constitutionality of that CDL. Also, I was never served any notice at my home residence which is the only place I could be served such notice but the several states did not take notice of the law; and I proved perjury in those false accusations by the dirty cops in Texas and in California especially as to now cite whoever in any way or degree delays or obstructs commerce by robbery or extortion or conspires to do so is guilty of violating the Hobbs Act Racketeering 18 USC 1951 and 1952 Travel Act by using facilities in interstate commerce in furtherance of any unlawful act, not to forget kidnapping at gunpoint by that dirty cop and other crimes. These criminal acts were financed by the USDOT, USDOJ/LEAA all to screw up the industry of food distribution in this entire country in the future of world government.

Those criminally induced illegal acts by those paid cops were transmitted across state lines to J. Doe in Missouri in 1997 especially, where by prearrangement 1936 Gooch v US, J. Doe became a conspirator in any criminal venture or enterprise by claiming to be able to circumvent the judicial processes by that license Div. of the Dept. of Revenue in Missouri, revoking that forced CDL without any notice of any civil suit filed in any court in Missouri to the best of my knowledge, so, he/she did rely upon "information" collected to which I was not privy nor could I confront those witnesses nor the collector of those bits of information before that arbitrary revocation as that act was not authorized by either the Congress nor the President as to deny property without due process of law as you people write consistently is the law. Greene v McElroy 1959. You people are the ones who wrote contract terms are a right which rights is property and that must be afforded Equal Protection of the laws also enforceable in the courts as 42USC1981 states unequivocally, again by your own rulings. J. Doe did commit an overt act in furtherance of the object of the conspiracy to make it succeed, by revoking that forced CDL. The conspirators include the USDOT Secretary, The Attorney General USDOJ, the LEAA Director in the USDOJ, every dirty cop who associated with any other dirty cop who ever "wrote" a "ticket" on the highway for which he/she was paid \$5.00 for each one they wrote illegally perjuring himself in the process as not one was/is legally issued as no court clerk issued any summons to appear in any local court as a response to any civil complaint that cop never made against me as I did/do not live within that local court's geographical jurisdiction to be issued any summons issued by any court clerk, therefore all and each one of those "convictions" were knowingly illegal as to deny due process by that dirty cops' inducement as he/she denied me my property, contract, rights by the gun not due process of law as the Court ruled in Terry v OHIO June 10, 1968 392US1,11 88Sct868 20Led2d889 any time a person is denied his right to leave, he has been "seized" and the 4th Amendment applies as well as the 5th's Miranda rights warning upon that "seizure", so such is violating my contract rights, property, without due process of law, compounded it by the local court not having personal jurisdiction over me to carry-out any trial on a bogus complaint never filed by that dirty cop not was I ever notified of any civil action against me at my home residence. Those "convictions" and subsequent assessment of points-on-licenses led to this day where I am forced to file criminal and civil suits against those responsible for this predicament, including J. Doe et al, for their knowingly acts of committing double jeopardy against my civil, constitutional and legal rights each and all secured by the Constitution's provisions in the 4th and 5th A's,

These acts were made criminal by the same government that violated its own rules enforcement.

In the end, J. Doe denied me, the victim, my right to due process to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation as the Attorney General's office did "prosecute" this case in secret my name but not me in person; the government's prosecuting agents made the process criminal by their very presence as to change it from a civil process into a criminal action, not litigation but prosecution; April 13, 1925 Cooke v US 267US567 45Sct390 69Led767. Because of J. Doe's acts of illegality, I petitioner, was put in harm's way on June 7, 1998 where another subsidized cop did violate me and my civil right to hold real and personal property against 14 shouting individuals, 2 armed, where I, standing alone, did sustain 17 blows with a fist from an enraged person who trespassed on my real and personal properties who had threatened to 'move me' if I did not get away from HIS TRUCK where he had trespassed on my property along with 10 of his cousins on June 7, 1998 where I did not have to flee off of my own property to protect my right to be on my own property where they had no right to be, then. For these acts I filed criminal charges against the cops who violated my property rights when they too trespassed on my land as one was called next door, not to my land. I filed these charges at 4:45PM CST on Jan. 6, 1999 in the WD OF MO. W.D, District Court in Kansas City, Missouri 64106., where they recorded this. The court clerk did violate 18USC1512(c)(3)(4) then the arrangement of the law Witness Tampering, by preventing me by force from arresting or seeking the arrest of another person for a possible federal offense and testifying or assisting in the prosecution of another person for a possible federal offense in a proceeding, and did deny me my right to communicate with a federal judge my knowledge of a federal law's violation by his arbitrary act on Jan. 6-11, 1999. He also did qualify under 18USC1513 as violating that law also on Jan. 6-11, 1999. Only because I did try to communicate to a federal judge my knowledge of federal law's violations by my writing 49 pages of detailed accounts of the federal offenses. For these and other reasons, I do believe I am entitled to redress of these and other grievances caused by the United States government's agents acts in response to my exercising my contract/property rights on the highways where I did pay the requisite tax to use them all, and because of my freedom to use those roads by first paying the taxes, I was not allowed to freely exercise those rights by the federal government's imposition of that illegal CDL in 1986. J. Doe's act did deny me my day in court and my right to be heard in that courtroom, so I think he/she is responsible to me for that damage to my reputation which by your own decision in 1873 is a civil right, also.

The ramifications of that CDL induced by the federal government demanding the States misuse constitutionally guaranteed property rights to be secure in that property not to be deprived of it without due process of law; namely by edict or decree not due process of law, using that person's Social Security Number, SSN, for identification on that forced CDL in order to get or keep working in one's chosen profession as in Greene v McElroy 1959, 1886 Boyd v US, slight deviations from legal modes of procedure and silent approaches and petty encroachments on civil, constitutional and legal rights, privileges and immunities by lesser agencies, departments, bureaus or commissions on fundamental rights by those silent approaches and slight deviations from legal modes of procedure, Jones v SEC 1936; The federal government forced us to be subjected to denial of our constitutionally guaranteed as enforceable contract rights, property, using that SSN which cannot be used for identification. This CDL was only applicable against truck drivers using SSN for identification, and as a consequence was the drug test which has spread throughout the entire country, now, and is abused by the federal and state governments against everyone now in America where it is used as a weapon to intimidate all as you are guilty until proven not guilty until the next time you are accused without any probable cause to get any government warrant to search, you are judged guilty until then. Anyone can accuse without being held responsible for any false accusations as non-governmental persons can accuse only by accusing indiscriminately, and with no liability to the one they accuse falsely.

The FBOP is converting to all PICA type machines so that is why this supplemental brief is not in Elite type.

Q. I saved the best for last: March 7, 1859 Ableman v Booth 21How506 16Led169  
A court having possession of a person or property, cannot be deprived of the right to deal with such person or property until its authority has been exhausted, and that no other court has the right to interfere with such custody or possession...No state can authorize one of its judges or courts to exercise judicial power by habeas corpus or otherwise within the jurisdiction of another and independent government..No judicial power, whatever form it may assume, can have lawful authority outside the limits of jurisdiction of the court or judge by whom it is issued, and an attempt to enforce it beyond these boundaries is nothing less than lawless violence.

These citations are for the court's edification as to what they wrote in the past and which is upheld today by every Court of Appeals on jurisdiction to be served notice of any pending civil suit outside one court's area of jurisdiction, it simply cannot be done. That brings up the double jeopardy effect of that forced CDL's ramifications as neither the Congress nor the President did sign any law which deprived us truck drivers of due process of law to have a fair day in court to be heard before being deprived of our lawfully held property, contract terms are property. J. Doe did just that by revoking that CDL arbitrarily without due process of law being afforded me. Greene v McElroy. My stated claim is to hold J. Doe and his employer responsible for all the acts that followed that illegal revocation of that forced CDL in the tune of many millions of dollars I was deprived of both earning and damages for that.

June 8, 1939 Morrison v Lipscomb CA6 877F2d 463 The State cannot criminalize by any law, any person's act of exercising any constitutional right or privilege. The Constitution's 14th Amendment denies the state's from depriving any citizen of any privilege or immunity by abridging those by any law; and Art. 4, § 2, cl.1 The Citizens of each state shall be entitled to all Privileges and Immunities of Citizens in the several States. Nov. 5, 1939 Hague v CIO 307US496,515 59Sct954,964 83Led423 Stone; **CONCLUSION** Wherever the title of streets and parks may rest, they have immemorial been held in trust for use of the public, and, time out of mind, have been used for purposes of assembly, communicating thoughts between citizens, and discussing public questions. Such use of the streets and public places, has, from ancient times, been part of the privileges, immunities, rights and liberties of all persons.

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted. As Morrison above: Any State attempt to limit an individual's right to go to court to have their rights vindicated is a matter of serious import. J. Doe did deny me my right to go to court by not notifying me of his proposed revocation of that forced CDL to have my day in court. J. Doe is liable for all the subsequent criminal acts by the state. Respectfully submitted,

Daniel R. Fisher

Date: July 16, 2019