

19-7966

ORIGINAL

FILED

MAR 04 2020

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Justin Odell Langford — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

VS.

William G. Cobb — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

U.S. Court of Appeals For the Ninth Circuit
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Justin Odell Langford #1159546
(Your Name)

LCC, 1200 Prison Rd
(Address)

Love Lock, NV 89419
(City, State, Zip Code)

(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

- 1) whether the Courts violated U.S. Const. Amend. 14 clauses on Due Process and Equal Protection?
- 2) Whether the Courts violated the supremacy clause?
- 3) Whether the courts violated U.S. Const. Amend. 5 clause on due process?
- 4) Whether the Courts violated U.S. Const. ~~ART. 1~~^{ART. 1}, Sec. 10, clause 1?
- 5) whether the 28 U.S.C. §1915 statute is unconstitutional?
- 6) Can The Courts waive Filing Fee Completely for non-incarcerated people while putting incarcerated person on a payment plan?

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.....	
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	
CONCLUSION.....	

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A *Langford v. Cobb* (U.S. Dist. Ct. Ruling)

APPENDIX B *Langford v. McNeill*, 2019 U.S. Dist. Lexis 131163

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES
Langford v. McNeill, 2019 U.S. Dist. Lexis 131163

PAGE NUMBER
Statement of The Case

STATUTES AND RULES

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☐ is unpublished.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 ~~A~~ to the petition and is

☒ reported at 3:19-cv-00326-MMD-CBC; 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☐ is unpublished.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 Dec 12, 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

U.S. Const. Amend. 14- Due Process

U.S. Const. Amend. 14- Equal Protection

U.S. Const. Amend. 5- Due Process

U.S. Const. Art. 6, §2- Supremacy Clause

U.S. Const. Art. 1, §10, clause 1

28 U.S.C. §1915

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Petitioner filed a summary civil suit against magistrate Judge William G. Cobb for unlawfully using my copyrighted stream "JUSTIN ODELL" without written permission U.S. Dist. Court magistrate Carla Baldwin Carry? Judge Miranda M. Du have chosen to construe it as a civil rights complaint when it wasn't. They issued an order to dismiss the case due to judicial immunity and grant the Informa Paperis, due to the fact that when Miranda M. Du dismissed Case #3:19-cv-00175-MMD-WGC (Langford v. McNeill), she denied the Informa Paperis. I'm arguing the fact that she should have done the same here in this matter. I'm also arguing the fact she should have done the same in this matter. I'm also arguing the validity of the Informa Paperis statute? application as Unconstitutional. See 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 131163. Also arguing that a court can't waive a filing fee completely for citizens not incarcerated while putting inmates on a payment plan when granting Informa Paperis statute.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Because the ruling of this matter will effect thousands of inmates in this Country and numerous civilians because it affects the validity of the in forma pauperis statute and in forma pauperis application. And may change the ruling on Judicial Immunity. With a matter that will effect millions of people in this nation this court should grant this petition and order full briefing in this matter.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Just. Orellana", written over a horizontal line.

Date: 2/25/20