

19-6986

IN

THE

ORIGINAL

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM 2019

NO. _____

JARVIS HUGO NEELY,

PETITIONER,

AGAINST

JOHN BALDWIN, ET AL.,

RESPONDENTS

Petition for a writ of Certiorari
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE 7TH CIRCUIT.

JARVIS HUGO NEELY R22838

STATZVILLE CORR CTR

P.O. BOX 112

JOLIET, IL 60434

RECEIVED

AUG 28 2019

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

QUESTION PRESENTED	Page #
PARTIES	1
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	1
DECISIONS BELOW	2
JURISDICTION	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	4
BASIS FOR FEDERAL JURISDICTION	6
REASONS FOR ^{GRANTING} [REDACTED] THE WRIT	6
A. CONFLICTS WITH DECISIONS OF OTHER COURTS	6
B. IMPORTANCE OF THE QUESTION PRESENTED	8
CONCLUSION	11

APPENDIX

Decision of the U.S. States Court of Appeals A

Order Denying The Rehearing to U.S. Court of Appeals. A

Order of The U.S. States District Court B

Question Presented

Whether sua sponte dismissal of complaint on the grounds of frivolous, fanciful and ^{lacking} a basis in reality was proper under 28 U.S.C. 1915 (d), when Petitioner proved the existence of Bio electro magnetic weapons and use by prisons, jails and law enforcement. The Plaintiff was entitled to proceed and the Court should have let the defendants answer the allegations, IN the Complaint.

Parties

The Petitioner is JARVIS HUGO NEELY, a Prisoner in Stateville Corr Ctr in Joliet, Illinois 60434

THE Respondents ARE JOHN Baldwin, I.DOC. Director, SHERIFF, McCoy OF PEORIA COUNTY JAIL, KIMBERLY BUTLER MENARD CORR CTR WARDEN. ANDREA TACK, Joliet Treatment Center (1) WARDEN, Godwin, #2 WARDEN. MARCUS HARDY, EX STATEVILLE WARDEN, MICHAEL MELVIN, RANDY FEISTER #1 and #2 Pontiac CORR CTR WARDENS. DR. DEIDRE MARANO, DR. DARNIKA GRAHAM, DR. JAMIE KORDICK, DR. HURLEY FOR Joliet Treatment Center. DR. SCOTT MCCORMICK, REGIONAL PSYCH OVERSEER. JOHN VARGA, JUSTIN WILKS, SONYA NICKLAUS, DIXON CORR CTR WARDENS. And any other JAMES and JOHN DOE(S).

DENTON V. HERNANDEZ 504 U.S. 25, 33, 112 S.Ct 1728 (1992) PG# 8, 9

BELL ATL. CORP. CORP V. TWOMBLY 550 U.S. 544-55 PG# 8, (2007)

DORAN V. MCGINNIS 158 F.Rd 383 87-89 PG# 8. (E.D. MICH 1994)

LORD BYRON, DON JUAN, CANTO XIV, STANZO 101, PG# 12

LT. STEFFAN, E. STEFFAN, & W. PRATT eds. 1977

DECISIONS BELOW

THE DECISIONS OF THE UNITED STATES OF APPEALS FOR THE 7th CIRCUIT IS UNREPORTED. IT IS CITED IN THE TABLE AT (Not cited) Neely v. Baldwin 1:18-cv-00732 AND A COPY IS ATTACHED AS APPENDIX A TO THIS PETITION (A.1 THE ORDER OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS IS NOT REPORTED. A COPY IS ATTACHED AS APPENDIX B TO THIS PETITION (B.1).

Jurisdiction

THE JUDGMENT OF THE UNITED STATES COURT
OF APPEALS FOR THE 7th CIRCUIT WAS ENTERED ON ^{APRIL} [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] 9, 2019, ^{DENIAL OF REHEARING 6/4/19} [REDACTED] IN ORDER DENYING A PETITION
for REHEARING TO U.S. DISTRICT ^{COURT} ENTERED ON 12-28-18
AND A COPY(S) ATTACHED AS APPENDIX B TO THIS
PETITION JURISDICTION IS CONFERRED BY 28
U.S.C. SECTION 1254 (1)

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

THIS CASE INVOLVES AMENDMENTS 8th, 4th AND 1st TO
THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION WHICH PROVIDES

8th RIGHT TO BE FREE FROM CRUEL AND UNUSUAL
PUNISHMENT.

4th THE RIGHT OF THE PEOPLE TO BE SECURE IN
THEIR PERSONS, HOUSES, PAPERS AND EFFECTS AGAINST
UNREASONABLE SEARCHES AND SEIZURES. SHALL NOT BE
VIOLATED, AND NO WARRANTS SHALL ISSUE, BUT UPON PRO-
BABLE CAUSE, SUPPORTED BY OATH OR AFFIRMATION, AND
PARTICULARLY DESCRIBING THE PLACE TO BE SEARCHED,
AND THE PERSONS OR THINGS TO BE SEIZED.

1st THE RIGHT OF THE PEOPLE PEACEABLY TO ASSEM-
BLE, AND TO PETITION THE GOVERNMENT FOR
A REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES

28 U.S.C. SECTION 1254 (1)

28 U.S.C. 1291

28 U.S.C. 1331

28 U.S.C. 1915 (d).

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

~~THE PETITIONERS COMPLAINT ALLEGED~~ that he was tortured by Bio ELECTRO MAGNETIC WEAPONS IN Peoria County Jail and throughout I.D.O.C. and the torture was unlawful and not Justified. He was Given hot Burning Sensations to Brain / Body / face etc. Headaches and MIGRAINES. He had EYE PROBLEMS, PENIS/SCROTUM ISSUES, heart PROBLEMS, LIMB PROBLEMS, HEARING PROBLEMS, INTESTINE ISSUES, HAIR LOSS, TEETH PROBLEMS, THROAT ISSUES, BRAIN DAMAGE, KIDNEY ISSUES, LUNG ISSUES, LIVER ISSUES, LASERING OF BONES IN BODY / FACE AND SKULL DEFORMITY. He claimed that the DEFENDANTS EITHER KNEW OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE WEAPONS and after BEING NOTIFIED didn't INTERVENE OR WERE THE ONES ADMINISTERING DEVICES. They are designed to ENSLAVE torture and kill, it also CREATES SYNTHETIC PATHOLOGIES OF DISEASES SUCH AS CANCERS, M.S., DIABETES AND CREATES LETHARGIC ENERGY, DIARRHEA, VOMITING, FEET ISSUES, KNEE ISSUES AND OTHER AILMENTS.

PETITIONER WAS SUBJECTED TO THIS TORTURE KNOWINGLY FROM 2015 TO PRESENT DAY, BUT UNBKNOWST to him MAYBE 20 YEARS OR MORE. PETITIONER had a homosexual dream IN Peoria County that he Gave a C.O. ORAL SEX and COULD NOT figure out OR UNDERSTAND why he would ever have a homosexual dream and was called a homosexual Behind his Back IN HENARD IN 2003, BUT COULD NOT figure out why he would Be labeled that when it was NOT true.

He then figured out later ~~after~~ EXPERIENCING
COLOR issues and weak Grip, that ~~it was~~ a device creat-
ING these symptoms in hind sight in 2014-15. The
District Court denied the Petition stating it was
frivolous, fanciful and lacking a Basis in Reality
Because of the allegations. The Petitioner in his
Petition for Rehearing to the district Court and
attached the capabilities of weapons I.E. Auditory
Hallucinations, NIGHTMARES, daydreams, synthetic telepathy and
thought interjection, homicidal/suicidal ideations, Homosexual
Pedophilic ^{Deviations} ~~Beastiality~~ INFLUENCE TECHNOLOGY, Blocking of
Normal Processes of memory and ^{thought} ~~probing~~ Probing of
orifices the damaging of any and every organ
in the Body. He also attached documentation that it
is used in ^{Prisons and} Jails. It was denied saying that the
Petitioner did prove existence of weapons, But did not
prove it ^{was happening} in Peoria County and throughout I.D.O.C.

Basis for Federal Jurisdiction

THE CASE RAISES A QUESTION DEALING WITH PETITIONERS 8th, 14th AND 1st AMENDMENT RIGHTS OF THE U.S. CONST. THE DISTRICT COURT HAD JURISDICTION UNDER 28 U.S.C. 1291, AND 28 U.S.C. 1331.

REASONS FOR GRANTING WRIT

A. CONFLICTS WITH DECISIONS OF OTHER COURTS.

THERE ARE NO CONFLICTS WITH OTHER DECISIONS JUST THE PETITIONER DISTINGUISHING OTHER FRIVOLOUS, FANCY CASES THAT LACK A BASIS IN REALITY FROM HIS OWN CASE. CASES SUCH AS DENTON V. HERNANDEZ 504 U.S. 25, 33, 112 S.Ct. 1728, 33, 118 L.Ed.2d 340 (1992), Bell ~~Corp.~~ CORP. V. TWOMBLY 550 U.S. 544-55 (2007), DORAN V. MCGINNIS 158 F.R.D. 383, 87-89 (E.D. Mich 1994) IN ALL THESE CASES THEY, THE PETITIONERS NEVER SHOWED PROOF OF EXISTENCE OR CAPABILITIES OF THESE WEAPONS AND THAT LAW ENFORCEMENT, PRISONS AND JAILS ALL OVER THE WORLD UTILIZE THESE WEAPONS, ALSO.

BEING THAT PETITIONER ALLEGED THAT PEORIA COUNTY JAIL AND I.D.O.C. ADMINISTERED THESE WEAPONS ^{AND THEY} ARE REAL AND ^{they} DO EXIST AND BEING THAT THE AFOREMENTIONED ARE AND DO FIT THE CRITERIA OF PRISONS, JAILS AND LAW ENFORCEMENT THE PETITIONER SHOULD HAVE BEEN ALLOWED TO PROCEED TO THE DISCOVERY STAGE AND THE DEFENDANTS SHOULD HAVE BEEN ALLOWED OR ORDERED TO ANSWER THE ALLEGATIONS.

ALSO IN REGARDS TO DENTON V. HERNANDEZ SO4 U.S.
~~25, 33, 112 S.Ct 1720, 33, 110 (1992)~~ WHEN HE CLAIMED
that he was drugged and RAPED 28 TIMES IN SEVERAL
institutions AND RAISED SEVERAL SUITS STATING THIS WAS
DONE. THE BIO ELECTROMAGNETIC WEAPON PROBES ORFICES AND
CAN PENETRATE INDIVIDUALS AND INDUCE DAYDREAMS AND
hallucinations that MAYBE MADE HIM THINK HE WAS BEING
RAPED. THE BIO ELECTROMAGNETIC WEAPON CAN ALSO PUT
YOU TO SLEEP OR WAKE YOU UP. INDIVIDUALS HERE IN
I.D.O.C. ARE COMPLAINING ABOUT THE SAME THING THAT
HERNANDEZ WAS SAYING IN REGARDS TO BEING RAPED.
THIS IS A NORMAL OCCURRENCE WHEN DEALING WITH A
BIO ELECTROMAGNETIC WEAPON.

IF HERNANDEZ WOULD HAVE MAYBE ATTACHED SOME
EXHIBITS ESTABLISHING EXISTENCE AND CAPABILITIES AND USE
BY LAW ENFORCEMENT JAILS AND PRISONS AND THAT HE
WAS PROBED BY A BIO ELECTROMAGNETIC WEAPON AFTER
BEING PUT TO SLEEP. HE MAY HAVE BEEN MORE BELIEV-
ABLE AND HIS ALLEGATION WOULD HAVE BEEN TAKEN MORE
SERIOUSLY BEING THAT THERE WAS AN EXPLANATION THAT
COULD EXPLAIN THE ISSUES HE WAS HAVING AND HE
MAY NOT HAVE BEEN LOOKED AT AS A DELUSIONAL,
BROKEN MAN. THESE BIO ELECTROMAGNETIC WEAPONS
HAVE BEEN AROUND SINCE MID TO LATE 80'S, EARLY 90'S
AND MOST INDIVIDUALS DON'T KNOW ABOUT THESE WEAPONS
AND THEY THINK THEY ^{HAVE EXPERIENCED} VIOLENT RAPES, HALLU-
CINATIONS, AUDITORY AND VISUAL AS WELL AS OTHER

FEATURES MAKE THE EXPERIENCE SEEM REAL AND ITS
HARD TO PROVE IT NEVER HAPPENED, IT ALSO CREATES
ILLUSIONS OF MENTAL ILLNESSES AND PHYSICAL ILLNESSES
AND THE SYMPTOMATIC PATHOLOGY OF DISEASES.

B. IMPORTANCE OF THE QUESTIONS PRESENTED

THIS QUESTION IS IMPORTANT BECAUSE THE COURTS
WHEN TRYING TO SAY THAT THESE ISSUES ARE FRIVOLOUS,
FANCIFUL AND LACK A BASIS IN REALITY WE NEED TO
KNOW WHAT NEEDS TO BE PROVEN BEFORE THE CONCEPT
OF FRIVOLOUS, FANCIFUL AND LACKING A BASIS IN REALITY
IS OVERCOME. IS IT EXISTENCE, THE MERE TASK OF
SHOWING THE COURTS SOMETHING EXISTS, OR IS IT ALSO
SHOWING A LIKELY POSSIBILITY AND PLAUSIBILITY WHEN
GIVEN ALL THE EVIDENCE THAT SOMETHING WHEN DRAWN
IN CORRELATION TO ANOTHER SIMILAR IN REGARDS TO
STRUCTURE, PUNISHMENT AND INNER WORKINGS - ETC MAY BE
TRUE AND WORTH LOOKING INTO WHEN MAKING AN
ALLEGATION OF CERTAIN NATURES. THE CALIFORNIA PRISONS
JAILS, AND LAW ENFORCEMENT AND OTHERS LIKE THEM
ACROSS THE WORLD ARE USING BIO ELECTROMAGNETIC WEAPONS
IN THEIR FACILITIES, LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES
ARE ALSO USING THESE TOOLS AS ALTERNATIVES TO
FIREARMS. IN PETITIONERS BRIEF TO THE FEDERAL DISTRICT
COURT AND THE FEDERAL COURT OF APPEALS, PETITIONER STATED
THAT HE AND OTHERS WERE TORTURED ON A REGULAR

Basis a Bio ELECTRO MAGNETIC WEAPON and he Produced affidavits and Declaration from inmates JONES and Lankford stating the same. HE stated that this happened to him in PEORIA COUNTY JAIL and throughout I.D.O.C., California Jails and PRISONS OPUNT divulged that they are using these weapons on PRISONERS in California in Pitchess Detention Center and that a Castaic Jail in California in August 2010, Raytheon SARCOS a military electronics company made a deal with them to use or test the weapons ON PRISONERS. THESE BIO-ELECTRO MAGNETIC WEAPONS ARE USED FOR RIOTS. Also others have divulged use so how would an issue this complex be addressed when the Court considers it frivolous, fanciful and lacking a Basis in Reality, when the weapons clearly exist in law enforcement, PRISONS and Jails, But have the capabilities to produce Nightmares, daydreams, Visual Hallucinations, Auditory Hallucinations, Headaches, MIGRAINES, ORGAN failure, CANCERS, Synthetic telepathy, depression, **HOMICIDAL / suicidal** ideations, Homosexual, Pedophilia and Beastiality deviations, Blocking of Normal Memory and thought Process, ^{astounding} other things or capabilities. How would a indigent Petitioner overcome that hurdle of frivolous, fanciful and lacking a Basis in Reality which warrants when

a dismissal sua sponte of a complaint especially in a situation where the issue is not commonly addressed, to the courts. In the instance of dismissing these sort of issues sua sponte how would the petitioner(s) address or get the relief that they deserve if the courts do not allow discovery, so the defendants can answer the complaint on their own, because there is no other way to prove this allegation unless the actual defendants say if they are using these devices/weapons, or not.

Petitioner states, that as this burgeoning era of technology grows the courts will see more issues dealing with bio electromagnetic weapons and other cybernetic weapons and it would be good for the courts to start to form some semblance of a precedent on how to deal with these issues now opposed to later, especially after establishing existence, possibility and plausibility then/complaints no matter how ^{strange} ~~strange~~ they sound should be able to proceed to the discovery stage. Quoting the old age insight that many allegations might be "strange, but true, for truth is always strange, stranger than fiction" Lord Byron, Don Juan, canto XIV, stanza 101 (T. Steffan, i.e. Steffan, & W. Pratt eds. 1977.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, certiorari should be granted in this case.

Date: 8-4-19

Respectfully Submitted, Jarvis H. Neely

NAME / address Jarvis Neely, P.O. Box 112, Joliet, IL 60434