

Case No: 20-5565

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES


MARY JO WEIDRICK, Petitioner/Plaintiff

v.

PRESIDENT DONALD J. TRUMP et al, Respondents/
Defendants

CERTIFICATION FOR PETITION FOR REHEARING

Petitioner hereby certifies that this Rehearing request is limited to the grounds specified in SCOTUS Rule 44(2). It is presented in good faith and not for delay.


Mary Jo Weidrick, Petitioner/Plaintiff

PETITION FOR REHEARING

Petitioner respectfully requests a Rehearing for the following reasons:

- 1.) As this Court knows, this case is not a “national security”, “investigation” or “terrorism” case against Petitioner as Petitioner has never engaged in pro-terrorism activities, conversations or curiosities. Defendants, named and unnamed, have forged all pro-terrorism materials and recruited named and unnamed Defendants to falsely corroborate such material or activity.
- 2.) **REASON 1:** Since Petitioner filed her Petition and this court has denied it, Petitioner believes unnamed Defendants Mark E. Zuckerberg , CEO of Facebook, and Jack P. Dorsey, CEO of Twitter, have confessed to forging pro-terrorism materials.
- 3.) **REASON 2:** Many people including named and unnamed Defendants have “widespread” knowledge all pro-terrorism materials are forged. Manhattan D.A. Cyrus R. Vance, Jr. has been investigating this case and most likely has those statements and other evidence of this criminal activity and terrorism and will secure more once he speaks to Petitioner.
- 4.) While Petitioner believes it is not possible to prove that named and unnamed Defendants have forged all the pro-terrorism materials they have attributed to Petitioner; they have the full assets of the United States government, both in and out of this country, to hide their activities and “fool us” when we subpoena them, and obstruct justice in other ways.

5.) Likewise, Petitioner will not be able most likely to prove at this time she did not manufacture or engage in any pro-terrorism activity or curiosities, first because she doesn't know what they've forged or how they've done it. However, once Petitioner is allowed to confer with her attorney and the Manhattan D.A., they will prove going forward no pro-terrorism activities are conducted by Petitioner.

6.) **REASON 3:** As this Court knows, part of the case is Petitioner is denied her First, Fourth, Fifth, Ninth Amendment rights as outlined in her Petition for Certiorari including being denied access to her attorney, Mark J. Geragos, and the Manhattan D.A., Cyrus R. Vance, Jr. If this Court were to give deference to named and unnamed Defendants and their falsified pro-terrorism materials, Petitioner would still have rights to confer with her attorney. In *Hamdi v. Rumsfeld*, 542 U.S.507 (2004), this Court concluded Mr. Hamdi, declared an "enemy combatant" by the U.S. government, maintained his Fifth Amendment due process rights to contest his detention, with access to an attorney, before a neutral decisionmaker.

This Court further rejected the government's argument that separation-of-powers prevents the judiciary from hearing Mr. Hamdi's challenge.

7.) **REASON 4:** Petitioner is unsure how Defendants are classifying her, unsure of any of the falsified evidence, thus Petitioner is unsure of what cases

to cite, if there are any. Petitioner's case may be unprecedeted. Petitioner does not have access to Westlaw or any attorney at this time

but her research on google shows of the "national security" type cases on U. S. soil, *Ex parte Milligan*, 71 U.S. (4 Wall.) 2 (1866) may apply wherein this Court ruled a U. S. citizen should be tried in a civilian court if open and available rather than a military tribunal.

8.) In *Rumsfeld v. Padilla*, 542 U.S. 426 (2004), U. S. citizen Jose Padilla was arrested in the U.S., eventually declared an "enemy combatant" and was denied access to an attorney. District Court Judge Mukasey rejected the government's denial Mr. Padilla's access to an attorney because of government fears counsel would interfere with Padilla's interrogation and that Padilla might use contacts with counsel to communicate with other terrorists.

9.) The appeals court reversed the district court's "enemy combatant" ruling finding the Authorization for Use of Military Force (AUMF) did not meet the requirement of the Non-Detention Act and that the President could not, therefore, declare American citizens captured outside a combat zone as enemy combatants hence ordered Padilla released without resolving the issue of access to his attorney; thus this Court did not see the case.

10.) **REASON 5: Time is of the essence:** POTUS-elect Joe Biden is an original terrorist from 31 years ago ---now joined by his wife---who not only

continue to violently rape, assault Petitioner's brain, sexually assault, slander victim Petitioner, he has threatened (to the media) to kill Petitioner; which is the stated mission of these terrorists and supported by their violent actions including denial of access to her attorney or any attorney and denial of access to any court. He cannot legally or constitutionally become POTUS.....once he and the balance of terrorists are no longer allowed to obstruct justice he will most likely be indicted for this terrorism.

11.) Vice President-elect and U.S. Senator Kamala Harris is a violent participating terrorist as well and will most likely be indicted, stand trial and most likely imprisoned as well as she cannot legally become a Vice President of the United States or continue her role as a U.S. Senator.

12.) Because the terrorists have infiltrated and taken over both the Presidency and both Houses of Congress for 31 years, it will be challenging to find the next person in the Presidential/Vice Presidential line of succession but must be addressed before these violent, dangerous persons try to illegally and unconstitutionally fulfil these roles or continue in Congress as they have been successful in doing for over 31 years....and of course keep this terrorism alive or continue to obstruct justice.

13.) **REASON 6:** This Court rejected Petitioner's request in 2018-19 to hear this case *ex parte*; it seems fair and proper Defendants should not be able

to continue in the courts without Petitioner and her attorney; the Manhattan D.A. if needed.

14.) **REASON 7:** Named and unnamed Defendants, 100's to 1,000's of them, are inside Petitioner's body via assaulting her brain and sexually assaulting her; people she would not allow in her home are allowed inside her brain and hence body which is a basic violation of human dignity. Their goals are intentionally to degrade and violate her....and the unnamed Defendants in the form of TV media and their guests have enjoyed it as have many U.S. Senators et al and seemingly enjoyed watching her scream in terror and torture for over 31 years.

15.) Seemingly whatever Petitioner's eyes see, named and unnamed Defendants see; Petitioner's "sights", like in all other humans, are processed IN Petitioner's brain. Even activity as personal as sex is processed in the brain.

16.) **REASON 8:** **The Doctrine of Common Sense.** Common sense as defined by Black's Law Dictionary states: "Sound practical judgment; that degree of intelligence and reason, as exercised upon the relations of persons and things and the ordinary affairs of life, which is possessed by the generality of mankind, and which would suffice to direct the conduct and actions of the individual in a manner to agree with the behavior of ordinary person."

a.) Petitioner believes “the ordinary person” would be appalled and outraged that the United States government, named and unnamed Defendants, have raped, assaulted, sexually assaulted Petitioner’s brain, hence body; have watched her shower, go to the bathroom, engage in feminine hygiene, if she were to have sex, change clothes....or just in general to have her moment-to-moment private thoughts violated AT ALL much less 24/7 for over 31 years. It destroys one’s brain; one’s life and it is violent 24/7; there is no place, no town, no state seemingly where Petitioner can run to escape this 24/7 violence.

b.) If named and unnamed Defendants had wanted a legitimate investigation of Petitioner, assuming mind-reading equipment was at some point legal to use on an American citizen, Petitioner would not have known it. Defendants wanted Petitioner to know they were violently assaulting, raping her brain and hence body commencing 10/31/89 in many ways including by using loud, stalking local citizens via the local participating TV and radio media regurgitating her thoughts, slandering her and her thoughts and making fun of both; threatening to kill her; using police sirens to reinforce Petitioner’s thoughts of their death threats and to violently disrupt her brain (which they still do to this day causing Petitioner to yell out in horror or terror). Common sense possessed by “the ordinary man” and

Petitioner maintains IF she had been engaging in any pro-terrorism or criminal activities or conversations, Petitioner would have stopped immediately on 10/31/89 to avoid giving away methods and sources and being arrested.

17.) **REASON 9:** There may not be a more important case in front of this Court ever: using mind-reading equipment on a U.S. citizen in the manner they have is deliberate violent, violent assault of one's brain and sexual assault and terrorism. The brain is located inside the head as well as other organs such as colon and vagina; movement, action and control of one's body, one's private thoughts, feelings, emotions emanate from the brain. The body's sensations also trigger activity in the brain whether it's pain in a joint or something more intimate like having sex.

18.) There is no more sacred space in the universe than inside the human brain. The brain is who each of us are as individuals and without it, we are not functioning individuals. For the U. S. government to decide to penetrate one's hallowed space that makes us "human" much less "individuals" is not only violent, but counter to our basic existence as a people; as a young democracy. **Every American deserves to be safe from all others including the United States government in their own homes....and more so to be safe from all others including the United States government inside their own bodies.**

PRAYERS:

19.) Petitioner believes this case has been in front of this Court by former U. S. Senator Kelly Ayotte, possibly Senator Rob Portman, her attorney, Mark J. Geragos, now Manhattan D.A. Cyrus Vance in some form or another for maybe 5-6 years? Clearly named and unnamed Defendants are still engaging in the criminal activity 24/7 and obstructing justice. Petitioner has filed possibly 5-6 actions in this Court since 2018; some have been sent back for correction but all have been rejected for unknown reasons.

20.) Petitioner hopes and prays she correctly addressed this Court's concerns as to her last Petition for Certiorari, thus respectfully requests her opportunity, after 31 years of 24/7 violent terrorism, to be heard so that she and her attorney, Mark J. Geragos, can confer and she may speak to Manhattan D.A. Cyrus R. Vance, Jr. for purposes of stopping this terrorism immediately and securing indictments against named and unnamed Defendants.

21.) As Petitioner does not know how the SCOTUS calendar works but due to the violence of having one's brain assaulted, raped, being sexually assaulted happening each second of each day by 100's to 1000's of violent named and unnamed Defendants, Petitioner respectfully requests this case be heard in this Court in ten (10) days of receipt of this Petition for Rehearing.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Jo Weidrick

Mary Jo Weidrick, Petitioner

1300 Rhodes Avenue


Sarasota, FL 34239

941-316-0273

November 13, 2020

Charles H. Barker

11-13-20



Case No. 20-5565

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

MARY JO WEIDRICK, Petitioner/Plaintiff


v.

PRESIDENT DONALD J. TRUMP, UNITED STATES

ATTORNEY GENERAL WILLIAM P. BARR; UNITED STATES CONGRESS
et al, Respondents/Defendants

I, Mary Jo Weidrick, hereby certify that on November 13, 2020, I mailed the Petition for Rehearing to the Clerk for the Supreme Court of the United States, 1 First Street, NE, Washington DC 20543. The following Respondents/Defendants were also mailed a copy of same:

Solicitor General of the United States
Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Room 5616
Washington, DC 20530-0001



Mary Jo Weidrick, Petitioner