

ORIGINAL

No. 19-6003

Supreme Court, U.S.  
FILED

SEP 19 2019

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

---

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

---

Patrick Christian – PETITIONER

Vs.

Manju Ganeriwala, et. al. – RESPONDENTS

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE 4<sup>TH</sup>  
CIRCUIT

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Ke  
436

CLERK'S OFFICE

2019 SEP 19 P 3:50

Patrick Christian  
Pro Se IFP Matter  
Displaced with no address  
p.christian77@yahoo.com  
No telephone number

RECEIVED

SEP 20 2019

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

## **QUESTIONS TO BE PRESENTED**

1. In accordance to Constitutional Law any Property Deprivation is a violation; therefore, why was this complaint dismissed and affirmed?
2. What constitutes any type of deprivation and what constitutes a conspiracy to do so?
3. Why is there a dilemma that over 92% of Pro Se IFP Civil Rights Complaints dismissed?
4. What is more validating and affirming than answering the legal questions posed in law, and is failure to do so a correctable error?
5. How can Defendants not be liable for the Property Right Deprivation, when the only way they can do so is through the performance of their official duties?

## LIST OF PARTIES

[✓]

Are Parties to the Proceeding in the court whose judgment is the subject of this petition is as follows:

Commonwealth State of Virginia  
Virginia Treasury Department  
Manju Ganeriwala, Treasurer  
101 North 14<sup>th</sup> Street  
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Commonwealth State of Virginia  
Virginia Treasury Department  
Vicki Bridgeman, Manager Unclaimed Property  
101 North 14<sup>th</sup> Street  
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Commonwealth State of Virginia  
Virginia Treasury Department  
William H. Dadmon, Manager Record & Property  
101 North 14<sup>th</sup> Street  
Richmond, Virginia 23219

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

OPINIONS BELOW .....	1
JURISDICTION .....	2
QUESTIONS TO BE PRESENTED .....	3
LIST OF PARTIES .....	4
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED .....	5
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS ...	6
STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....	7
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT .....	8
CONCLUSION .....	9
PROOF OF SERVICE .....	10
CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE .....	11

## **INDEX OF APPENDICES**

APPENDIX A	Order of Dismissal by USEDVA	12-13
APPENDIX B	Informal Brief to USCA4	14-17
APPENDIX C	Order Remanding Brief USCA4	18-19
APPENDIX D	Order Amending Complaint USEDVA	20-22
APPENDIX E	Amended Complaint to USEDVA	23-25
APPENDIX F	Order Dismissing Amendment	26-28
APPENDIX G	Informal Brief to USCA4	29-34
APPENDIX H	Order Affirming Dismissal USCA4	35-36
APPENDIX I	Petition to Rehar En Banc to USCA4	37-38
APPENDIX J	Order Denying En Banc Rehearing	39

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 681, Supreme Court of the United States. Judgment entered May 18, 2009.
- Beaudett v. City of Hampton, 775 F.2d 1274, 1278, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit. Judgment entered November 4, 1985.
- Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555-56, 557-58, Supreme Court of the United States. Judgment entered May 21, 2007.
- Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp., 337 U.S. 541, 545-546, Supreme Court of the United States. Judgment entered June 20, 1949.
- Francis v. Giacomelli, 588 F.3d 186, 192, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit. Judgment entered December 2, 2009.
- Goode v. Cent. Va. Legal Aid Soc'y INC., 807 F.3d 619, 623, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit. Judgment entered December 9, 2015.
- Hill v. Braxton, 277 F.3d 701, 707, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit. Judgment entered Jan. 14, 2002.
- Laber v. Harvey, 438 F.3d 404, 413 n.3, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit. Judgment entered February 16, 2006.
- Sewraz v. Guic, No.3:08cv035, 2008 WL; 3926443, at \*2, U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia. Judgment entered August 26, 2008.

---

Cases cited by the Court have nothing to do with fiduciary matters; therefore, misplaced; 1&3-reversed and remanded: 2&5-affirmed: 8-dissenting justices reversed in part, vacated in part, & affirmed in part: 6-remanded: 7-vacated & remanded in like manner this writ should also be granted and litigation follow.

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 J 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 A 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 27 August 2019.

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

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

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

United States Constitution, Amendment I – Congress shall make no law prohibiting or abridging...the right of the people..."to petition the government for a redress of grievances".

United States Constitution, Amendment V – No person shall be...denied of life, liberty, and property without Due Process of Law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.

United States Constitution, Amendment XIV – All persons born ...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 equal protection of the laws.

Code of Virginia §18.2-111 Embezzlement deemed larceny; indictment. If any person wrongfully and fraudulently use, dispose of, conceal, or embezzle any money...tangible or intangible, which he shall have received...by virtue of his office, trust, or employment, or which have been entrusted or delivered...shall be guilty of embezzlement....

U.S.C. §1005 Embezzlement – The fraudulent appropriation of property by a person to whom such property has been entrusted....



## **STATEMENT OF THE CASE**

The Defendants during the performance of their official duties did take possession of the Plaintiffs Intangible Property and refuses to turn the records over to him so he can review them and claim his property either they have destroyed, altered, and/or withheld these records creating the Conspiracy Deprivation and Federal and State Code violations, all assisted by the judiciary, in which the use of a Polygraph to evoke honesty can assist this court during Redress, while potential judicial discrimination continues "against a Pro Se Litigant" are the legal question that this Writ of Certiorari poses. This is adamant due to the fact no Government Official would speak up for what is right, and all refuses to be honest. Measuring the Courts discretion should primarily be based upon seeking justice, redress, and reconciliation requiring their expeditious actions, all while exhibiting "Good Behavior", and any deviation is a Constitutional and Canonical violation.

## **REASON FOR GRANTING THE PETITION**

The primary reason for granting this PETITION is to seek justice, which is the sworn duty of each Official, especially the Judicial System.

The secondary reason is that we must get to the bottom of this Conspiracy, since too many records, including the legal records in the 13<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court, Financial Records, the Medical Records, the Insurance Records, and the General legal records of Plaintiff have been altered, destroyed, and/or being withheld by Color Bearers/Oath Takers; unfortunately, many levels of Court are aware of these, yet refuse to exercise their adversarial roles.

## CONCLUSION

The UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT has always been the main advocate in meeting the fundamental rights of all citizens as society evolved and is evolving. This is another one of those times. Plaintiff has been victimized, kept indigent, is stalked, and has his privacy evaded all due to this Conspiracy, which Grievances from which has not been Redressed. This is the step to that process. The only basis this petition for a WRIT OF CERTIORARI be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

*Patrick Christian*

Patrick Christian

Date: 17 August 2019