


ORIGINAL

20-5678



IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Charise L. Lagan — PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

vs.  
Homeland Security et al — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, Louisiana  
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Charise L. Lagan  
(Your Name)

3005 S. Center St. #K-1011  
(Address)

Arlington, Texas 76014  
(City, State, Zip Code)

214-462-2430  
(Phone Number)

817-609-0870 prof. 1  
682-230-1501 prof. 2

## QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

IN OBSERVANCE OF OUR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO LIFE, LIBERTY AND THE PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS, TO LIVE WITH MASLOW'S FIVE HIERARCHY NEEDS AND THE PROTECTION, AS WELL AS, THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ALL APPLICABLE LAWS GRANTED TO ANY FREE CITIZEN OF THE U.S.A., TO UTILIZE WITH AUTHORITY THESE LAWS TO CEASE AND PREVENT VIOLATIONS OF THE LAW WITH EXISTING SYSTEMATIC OPPRESSION IN THE LIFE OF THE APPELLANT, CHARISE L. LOGAN

- 1) DID THE LOWER COURTS FAIL TO HONOR THE APPELLANTS FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHT, BY GIVING A PROPER REVIEW OF HER COMPLAINT INCLUDING OVER 600 (543?) EXHIBITS AND THEREFORE, FAILED TO DETECT NUMEROUS FEDERAL JURISDICTIONAL LAW VIOLATIONS?
- 2) GRANTED, THE RANGE AND VARIATION OF ANY SINGLE OPINION, OF WHAT "GOOD FAITH," IS TO ONE INDIVIDUAL, MAY NOT BE "GOOD FAITH," TO ANOTHER.

GRANTED, IN THIS CURRENT TIME, WHAT'S "FRIVOLOUS" TO ONE INDIVIDUAL, MAY NOT BE "FRIVOLOUS" TO ANOTHER.

GRANTED, WHAT WAS CONSIDERED "FRIVOLOUS IN 1915," WHEN THAT LAW WAS CREATED... HAS BEEN OVERCOME WITH RIGHTS FOR WOMEN AND COLOREDS TO VOTE, CIVIL RIGHTS: REMOVING SEGREGATED DRINKING FOUNTAINS, BATHROOMS, PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION BUSES, PUBLIC SCHOOLS, AND AFTER 80 YEARS OF THE "FRIVOLOUS" CRIES OF PRISONERS, PRISON REFORM IN 1995...

DID THE LOWER COURTS DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY SEEK TO ASSIST THE DEFENDANTS, ESPECIALLY, THE CIA AND THE HONORABLE BUSH FAMILY IN A CONSPIRACY, TO COVER UP THE TRUTH CONCERNING THE APPELLANT'S COMPLAINT, AND MISAPPROPRIATELY APPLIED THE 1915 "FRIVOLOUS," LAW, BECAUSE THE COURTS DIDN'T WANT TO JUDGE, NOR ORDER RESTITUTION AND AN APOLOGY CONCERNING A MASSIVE COVER UP, WITH A MULTITUDE OF ILLEGAL VIOLATIONS, BESIDES THE EMBARRASSMENT OF THE ATTEMPT TO DO SO?

- 3) GIVEN THE STATEMENT BY THE APPELLANT, CHARISE L. LOGAN WITHIN HER COMPLAINT SUBMITTED AT THE LOWER COURTS, THERE ISN'T ANY AUTHORIZATION BY THE PLAINTIFF FOR THE ALLEGED "UNAUTHORIZED TESTING." NOR WAS THE APPELLANT INFORMED OF ANY TESTING....

IF, THE C.I.A. OPERATED WITHIN ANY CONTRACT DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY TO PERFORM TESTING AFTER APPROVAL BY THE D.N.I. AND ATTORNEY GENERAL PROCESS... (WHICH WILL BE PETITIONED IN DISCOVERY)

- A) DID THE OBSERVING C.I.A. PHYSICIANS AND PSYCHOLOGISTS ASSIGNED TO MONITOR ANY APPROVED TEST OR COUNTER-TESTING FAIL BY THE OPINION OF COLLEGEES, COWORKERS AND/OR THE GENERAL PUBLIC CEASE ZEROING IN UPON CHARISE L. LOGAN, FAIL TO CEASE MENTAL AND PHYSICAL TORMENTING UPON APPELLANT INCLUDING DEMORALIZATION AND DEFAMATION OF HER CHARACTER, ESPECIALLY WITHIN WALMART?
- B) DID THE C.I.A. FAIL TO CARRY OUT U.S. COMMUNITY DIRECTIVE 191?

iii

## 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:

**HOMELAND SECURITY, CENTRAL INTELLIGENT AGENCY, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, THE HONORABLE PRESIDENT DONALD TUMP, THE HONORABLE PRESIDENT GEORGE D. BUSH, THE HONORABLE PRESIDENT BARAK OBAMA, THE HONORABLE MICHELLE OBAMA, U.S. ARMY RETIREE GEORGE (ATLANTA, GA.), CALVIN B. DAVIS, WENDY LOGAN, OVERLAND PARK, KANSAS POLICE DEPARTMENT, ARLINGTON, TEXAS POLICE DEPARTMENT, FORTH WORTH, TEXAS POLICE DEPARRTMENT, BLOOMINGTON, MINNESOTA POLICE DEPARTMENT, RICHHFIELD, MINNESOTA POLICE DEPARTMENT, DON ELITS, EDMOND WITHERSPOON, GM/ (ON BEHALF OF SUBSIDARY GM UNIVERSAL), DFW AIRPORT, WALMART INC., BALLY'S (ON BEHALF OF LA FITNESS), KROGER INC., MEMHEIM INC., (ON BEHALF OF DALLAS-FORTHWORTH), CARMASX INC., CBS/ AT&T STADIUM, CITIFINANCIAL, INC., UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS ARLINGTON, DEFENDANTS- APPELLEE(S)**

**\*\*\*THE FOLLOWING DEFENDANT(S) APPELLEE(S) WERE NOT ASKED FOR A SINGLE CENT .01 OF MONITARY RELIEF, BUT A WRITTEN APPOLGY.**

**THE HONORABLE PRESIDENT DONALD TUMP, THE HONORABLE PRESIDENT GEORGE D. BUSH, THE HONORABLE PRESIDENT BARAK OBAMA, THE HONORABLE MICHELLE OBAMA, U.S. ARMY RETIREE GEORGE (ATLANTA, GA.), CALVIN B. DAVIS, WENDY LOGAN, DON ELITS, AND EDMOND WITHERSPOON.**

## RELATED CASES AND/OR INVESTIGATIONS

The Appellant would like to reserve the right of discovery, as there are over several thousand cases listed upon the CIA website:

<https://www.cia.gov/library/readingroom/search/site/ME%20ULTRA>. With regards to MKULTRA and "Unauthorized Human experimentation." I believe, the Appellant has enclosed more than enough with the following application sheets and the brief courts. Thank you

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....	1
JURISDICTION .....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED.....	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	8
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT.....	17
CONCLUSION.....	24

## INDEX TO APPENDICES

**APPENDIX A:** FIFTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS JUDGMENT 19-11208

**APPENDIX B:** 19-11208 DOCKET OF THE FIFTH COURT OF APPEALS

**APPENDIX C:** ORDER OF THE NORTH DALLAS DISTRICT COURTS

HONORABLE JUDGE BARBARA LYNN 11/13/2019

**APPENDIX D:** NOTICE OF APPEAL, PLAINTIFF, CHARISE LOGAN 11/5/19

**APPENDIX E:** JUDGMENT OF THE NORTH DALLAS DISTRICT COURTS

HORABLE JUDGE BARBARA LYNN 10/22/2019

**APPENDIX F:** STATEMENT OF DECLARATION, 19-11208.777-.782

**APPENDIX G:** APPELLANTS BRIEF CASE NO. 19-11208 UNITED STATES  
FIFTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

**APPENDIX H:** APPELLANTS RECORD EXCERPTS CASE NO. 19-11208

UNITED STATES FIFTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

**APPENDIX I:** RECEIPT DEPT. OF VETERANS AFFAIRS 19-11208.958

**APPENDIX J:** MICHELLE OBAMA'S POWERFUL NEW HAMPSHIRE SPEECH

**HIGHLIGHTING- SEVERAL EXHIBITS TO FIND OUT THE "CAUSE OF ACTION."**

**APPENDIX K:** LETTERS TO DIR. OF SECRET SERVICE JULIA PEIRSON & NEXT  
(W/POLYGRAPHS GIVEN TO DIR. PEIRSON, GOVERNOR & PRESIDENTS)

**APPENDIX L:** CERT. LETTER OFFICER GARROTA ROA. 19-11208.420-.426 +.431-.432

**APPENDIX M:** CERT. LETTERS & FAXES GOV. RICK PERRY ROA. 19-11208.427-.728

**APPENDIX N:** LETTER & FAXES DALLAS F.B.I. ROA. 19-11208.429-.430

**APPENDIX O: LETTER: CHICAGO P. D. INTERNAL AFFAIRS ROA. 19-11208.532-.534**

**APPENDIX P: LETTER: FT. WORTH P.D. INTERNAL AFFAIRS ROA. 19-11208.455-.465**

**APPENDIX Q: LETTER TO ARLINGTON I.S.D. FOR STUDENTS ROA. 19-11208.472-.475**

**APPENDIX R LETTER TO MR. TRUMP 8/2/2012, ROA. 19-11208.628-19-11208.629**

**APPENDIX S: LETTER TO PRESIDENT TRUMP 1/17/2017 ROA. 19-11208.634-.636**

**APPENDIX T: 2013 NOTARIZED LETTER MAILED TO MEDIA, CLERGY & CELEB'S REQUESTING TO GO TO PROTECTIVE CUSTODY ROA. 19-11208.910-.911**

**APPENDIX U: CERTIFIED LETTER SASHA & MALAYAH OBAMA 8/2012**

**ROA. 19-11208.445-.457**

**APPENDIX V: TWC COMPLAINT INVITATION TO MEDIATION AND REQUEST FOR INFORMATION DOCUMENT CONFIRMING LAWS BROKEN DURING EMPLOYMENT AT WALMART & THUS, GRANTING THE PERMISSION TO PURSUE RESTITUTION BY ARBITRATION OR OTHER LEGAL OPTIONS. TWC ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF CIVIL WRONGS WITH CITIFINANCIAL & TEXAS STATE BAR - OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE= FAILURE TO DISCLOSE**

**APPENDIX W: ALLEGED UNAUTHORIZED TESTING HEALTH CLUBS: FITNESS CONNECTION AND PLANET FITNESS. (L.A. FITNESS EXHIBITS ON FILE, ALSO)**

**APPENDIX X: PAGES OF LICENSE PLATES UPON WALMART PARKING LOT DURING ALLEGED "UNAUTHORIZED TESTING."**

**APPENDIX Y: ALLEGED "UNAUTHORIZED TESTING," LONG HORN RESTAURANT**

**APPENDIX Z: ALLEGED "UNAUTHORIZED TESTING," DRURY HOTELS, KS**

**APPENDIX A1: ALLEGED "UNAUTHORIZED TESTING," FAIRFIELD MARRIOTT"**

**APPENDIX B1: ALLEGED "UNAUTHORIZED TESTING," STILLWATER GRANDATAY**

**APPENDIX C1: ALLEGED "UNAUTHORIZED TESTING," ARLINGTON PLC. LBRY.**

**APPENDIX D1: ALLEGED "UNAUTHORIZED TESTING," GM UNIVERSAL IN TEXAS**

**APPENDIX E1: ALLEGED "UNAUTHORIZED TESTING," APT. PRO'S @ WORK SITE**

**APPENDIX F1: CONSPIRACY PROVEN: SUCCESSFUL POLYGRAPH 1 OF 3**

**APPENDIX G1: LEE'S CLASSIC CAR RECEIPT 2<sup>ND</sup> REPLACEMENT OF DAMAGE TO AXEL OF CAR: 2X WITHIN A 6 MONTH PERIOD. OTHER RECEIPT STATES IT APPEARS SOMEONE INTENTIONALLY TRIED TO KICK THE AXEL OUT @ BALL JOINT.**

**APPENDIX H1: 3 CERTIFIED LETTERS SENT TO FAMILY, FRIENDS & CLERGY OF DEFENDANT OFFICER CALVIN B. DAVIS, TO ATTEMPT TO OBTAIN "A CAUSE OF ACTION," AND BUILD PEACE. 2005, A COPY OF A LETTER TO PASTOR WILLIE BURREL WAS GIVEN TO PASTOR TIMOTHY ROSS, OF THE POTTERS HOUSE.**

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITES

<b>CASES</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
Coppedge v. United States, 369 U.S. 438, 447 (1962).....	30
Keko v. Hingle, 318 F.3d 639 C.A.5 (LA) 2003.....	26
Dennis v. Sparks, 449 U.S. 24 (U.S., 1980) .....	26
Halkin v. Helms, 194 U.S. App. D.C. 82, 90, 598F.2d1.....	30
United States v. Marchetti, 466 F.2d 1309, 1318(CA4).....	30
U.S. Supreme Court, CIA v. SIMS, 471 U.S. 159 (1985).....	30
471 U.S. 159 CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY ET AL. v. SIMS ET AL. CERITORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT NO. 83-1075 Argued December 4, 1984 Decided April 16, 1985.....	23,30
<b>Statutes:</b>	
40 U.S. Code 1315- Chapter 13 Making Protected Critical Infrastructure Information Ava, 4,7,13	
42 U.S. Code§ Chapter 21B.....	7,15
42 U.S. C. A. § 1983.....	22
47 U.S.C. §223 Obscene or harassing telephone calls.....	6
47 U.S.C. §4002(2)(B)(2015).....	7
465 U.S.1078 (1984) and 467 U.S. 1240 (1984).....	35
1955 Clayton Act Laws Sect 4B(1),(2),(3).....	7,11,23,28
Created & Stored Communications Act 18 U.S.C. Chapter 121 §§2701-2712.....	7
Criminal Trespassing Federal & State.....	7
E-Government Act 2007, S.2301-110 <sup>th</sup> Congress (2207-2008).....	7
E-Government Act 2007, S.2321-110 <sup>th</sup> Congress (2007-2008) 552 Title 5 Governor Act.....	7
Homeland Security Act 2002 Public Law 107-347.....	7
Id. At 33, 28 U.S.C. § 1915 (e),(2).....	26
LA Rev Stat §14:87.2(2016).....	22
MKULTRA [471 U.S.159,174].....	22
Research and Development Act 2002, HR 3394 107 <sup>th</sup> Congress 2001-2002.....	7
Executive Order No. 12333, Dec. 4, 1981, <b>46.FR59941.3CFR</b> Amd. & Anx...3,4,10,11,14,21,23	
Executive Order No. 12333, B 2.10 3CFR 213(1982) .....	6,8

VI

Executive Order No. 12891, Jan 15, 1994.....	6
Executive Order No. 12333, 1.3 Delegation .....	3, 11
Executive Order No. 12333, 2.2 Purpose/Balance.....	3,11,12
Executive Order No. 12333, 2.6 Protection.....	3,12
Executive Order No. 12333, 3.3 Safeguards Procedures.....	3,11,12
Executive Order No. 12333, 3.3 Purpose with Procedures.....	3,11,12
Executive Order No. 12333, 3.3 Collection Procedures.....	3,11,12
Executive Order No. 12333, 4.4.1Special Collections Techniques.....	5,14
Executive Order No. 12333, 4.4.3(c) Testing and Training activities with consent.....	3,11,12
Executive Order No. 12333, 4.4.3(d) Direction against live signals.....	3,12
Executive Order No. 12333, 4.4.3(f) (2) Activities limited in extent and duration.....	3,12,13
Executive Order No. 12333, 4.4.3(f) (3) Training and Testing doesn't exceed 90 days.....	3,12,13
Executive Order No. 12333, 4.4.3(f)(4) The Activities don't target "particular person".....	4,12,13
Executive Order No. 12333, 4.4.3(f)(6) Information is not retained or disclosed to.....	4,5,13,14
Executive Order No. 12333, 4.4.3(f)(6) False Personation.....	4,13,23
Executive Order No. 12333, 4.4.3(f)(7) Training Approved by General Counsel.....	4,14
Executive Order No. 12333, 4.4.4 Counter Measures Related to Electronic Surveillance Eq.....	4,14
Executive Order No. 12333, 5 Approval and Documentation Requested.....	5,14
Executive Order No. 12333, 7 Retention of Information w/ U.S. Persons.....	5,14
Executive Order No. 12333, 8 Dissemination of Information w/U.S. Persons.....	5,14
Executive Order No. 12333,8.1, 8.2, Dissemination Inside & Outside Intelligence Com.....	5,14
Executive Order No. 12333, 9.1,9.2 Disclosed Participation.....	4,5,12,15
Executive Order No. 12333, 9.3-9.3.2 Undisclosed Participation.....	4,5,12
Executive Order No. 12333, 10.1-10.2 Missed Checkpoints of Accountability.....	4,5,12,14,15
Fair Act Laws.....	7
U.S. Code § 73: 1503, 1505, 1506, 1510, 1511, 1512, 1513.....	7,23
U.S. Intelligence Community Directive 191.....	17,28
Violence Against Womans Act 2005 (A), (B) Title IV, Secv40001-40703,,,,.....	6
18 U.S.C. Part 29 Protect PC11.....	4,7,13,23
18 U.S.C. § Chapter 43, 911, .....	

18 U.S. Code§ 371.....	7,23
18 U.S.C. § 875 c.....	6,23
28 U.S.C. § 1915 (e), (2).....	15,17
18 U.S.C. § 1028A(a)(1).....	7
18 U.S.C. § 1030 (a)(2)(c).....	,,7
18, U.S.C. § 2261A (1), (2).....	6,23
18 U.S.C. §2510-2521.....	7
18 U.S.C. § 2422 (b) Enticement / Coercion of a Minor.....	6,17
18 U.S.C. §2510 (4)(m), 2511 (1) 2915.....	7,18
18 U.S.C. § 2511 (2)(a)(1) – (2)(c)-(d).....	7,18
18 U.S.C. § 2511 (2) (c) (d).....	7,18
18 U.S.C. § 2701-2712.....	7
18 U.S.C. § 2703 (c), 2703 (f) 2915.....	7,18
<i>18 U.S.C. § 3121-3127,3127(3), 3127(4).....</i>	7

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 Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals; 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 E to the petition and is  
 reported at North Dallas District Courts; 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 4/24/2020.

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: N/A, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix N/A.

[ ] An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including N/A (date) on N/A (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

### Executive Order No. 12333

1.3 delegation of authority to the CIA in accordance with Procedures established by the Director of CIA and approved by the Attorney general, after, consultation with the Director of national Intelligence,

2.2 “failing to maintain” “proper balance “with acquisition” and “protection of individual interest” and “their constitutional rights,”

2.6, by failing to protect “any element,” of the “Intelligence Community.”

The U.S. person, to whom which information is being collected is significant in volume, proportion, sensitivity and “failed to enhance safeguards,” with the observation of the U.S. persons fourth amendment and their “reasonable privacy.”

3.3 failure to provide enhanced safeguards,

3.3 General Principles with numerous counts violating CIA activities shall have a “purpose” consistent with the CIA procedures, authorities and responsibilities of the CIA with any collection procedures and shall collect only the amount of information “reasonably necessary” to support “that purpose.”

3.3 with another checks and balances established with the Appellant’s constitutional rights by “failure to comply with the Department of Justice to provide “enhanced safeguards” “beyond those specifically set forth” in any authorized purpose and collection procedure.

Additional safeguards, that can be implemented based upon one or more of the following individual classifications:

4.4.3 (c) testing and training activities violated “without consent,”

(d) The CIA directs the testing and training activities against “live signals” environments, local and recorded abroad.

(f)(2) The activities are “limited in extent” and “duration” to “those necessary to train” “personnel” in the use of electronic surveillance equipment and to determine the capability and performance of that equipment,

(f)(3) The training or testing activity does not exceed ninety calendar days,

4.4.3 (f) (4) (f)(4) The activities “do not” intentionally “target” the communications of a “particular person,”

(f)(6) Information derived from communications intercepted in the course of the activities is not retained or disclosed to “any person” other than a person

**directly participating in such activity** (such as trainees and their instructors, not the public, clergy, nor retired military persons, which has overlapping violations)

**(f) (6) of False Personation 18 U.S. Code of Federal Regulations Part 29 protect PCII from public Disclosure,**

**(f)(7) The training is approved in writing by the responsible Head of Directorate or Mission Center or designee with the concurrence of the General Counsel**, based on their determinations that the particular training or testing program conforms to these Procedures and is otherwise lawful. **No testing of electronic surveillance equipment** **inside the United States may exceed “ninety calendar days,” without the prior approval of the Attorney General.**

**9.1.9.2 disclosed participation,**

**9.3-9.3.2 Undisclosed participation and undisclosed participation “requiring particular approvals”**

**10.1, 10.2 missed check points, of accountability and negligence.**

**40 U.S. Code 1315- Chapter 13, making protected critical infrastructure information available,**

**42 U.S. Code § 1985, (1), (2) Obstructing Justice intimidating a party(Plaintiff), witness, juror, (3) conspiring to go in disguise or on the highway or the premises of another, for the purpose of depriving, either directly or indirectly a person of the equal protection, constitutional rights),**

\*\*\*\*and **any printout or other recording** is destroyed before or immediately upon completion of the activity or in the case of training, as soon as, reasonably possible,

The Plaintiff alleges all three defendants: Homeland Security, Central Intelligence Agency, and U.S. Department of Defense **failed, to return in writing or by telephone, any correspondence (except the U.S. Department of Justice in 2010, after reporting Attorney Denise Valini of Olgatree, Deacons & Associates for allegedly “failing to disclose” and “obstruction of justice,” which was a redirected letter of responsibility, so I filed my complaint with The State of Texas, State Bar) bring into “accountability identified violators,” when the government defendants, became aware of the electronic surveillance abuse** and outright intentionally, broke the law with **the Executive**

**Order No. 12333 and its entirety, amendments and annexes**, when the violators and/or the Countermeasure procedures acted with or without consent of **Executive Order No. 12333**,

**4.4.4 Countermeasures related to electronic surveillance equipment.**  
The Plaintiff alleges all three defendants violated

**4.3.3 in United States, Canada, and Aruba Island with standard collection techniques to conduct communications security investigations, physical security investigations, or personnel security investigations without approvals within the established Procedures, except that the use of concealed monitoring techniques require General Counsel concurrence.**

**Order 4.4.1 Special Collection Techniques with “outsourcing and/or delegation,” with collection techniques to: the Dallas F.B.I., Chicago F.B.I. and any public, corporate or sole proprietor entities hired or assigned under confidential contracts, rather considered or classified as an Central Intelligence Element, or not. The Plaintiff reserves the right with discovery for any violations with Executive Order No. 12333,**

**5 Approval and Documentation Requirements for Bulk and Certain Other Collection Activities. The Plaintiff alleges violations with all three defendants with Executive Order**

**No. 7. Retention of Information Concerning U.S. Persons, Section 8 Dissemination of Information Concerning U.S. Persons,**

**8.1 Dissemination “inside” the Intelligence Community,**

**8.2 Dissemination “outside” the Intelligence Community, Section 9. Participation in Organizations in the United States, whereby the Plaintiff alleges other defendants were recruited, trained and coerced into conducting**

**“duly authorized” intelligence activities, those acting on behalf of the CIA may participate in organizations in the United States only in accordance with the Procedures and 9.1 Applicability,**

**9.2 Disclosed participation,**

**9.3-9.3.2 “Undisclosed participation” and undisclosed participation requiring particular approvals. The Plaintiff alleges there are numerous violations and numerous counts of the violations compounded within the CIA and overlapping with Homeland Security and Department of Defense with**

**Executive Order No. 10 Compliance and Oversight Responsibilities:**

**10.1 Compliance, 10.2.1-2.6 Oversight responsibilities. Plaintiff alleges the Defendant additionally failed to protect her and other potentially endangered citizens of the public, by inappropriate access to the functions of the automobiles: 2003 Honda Accord and 2002 Oldsmobile Alero she was driving on several occasions.**

Plaintiff alleges the Defendants failed to protect from illegal access to cyberspace control of the Plaintiffs personal automobile, whereby the Plaintiff alleges access codes were distributed from government officials/employees to non-government employees, with intent to bully, intimidate and impair the Plaintiff's driving abilities by accessing the mechanics of

**her automobiles: 2003 Honda Accord, the mechanics of the starter, ignition switch, and transmission.** 2003 Honda Accord: bullying with illegal access to make the Plaintiff, alleges these bullying actions made the Plaintiff late to work or undependable transportation, by utilizing a cutoff-ignition switch, illegal access to the mechanics of the Plaintiff's transmission, Arlington & Fort Worth, Texas 2012-2015. **The Plaintiff alleges the defendant failed to protect her from another single isolated incident with the 2002 Oldsmobile Alero driving on Dexter R**

Plaintiff alleges the Defendant failed to protect from illegal access to cyberspace control of the Plaintiffs personal automobile, whereby the **Plaintiff alleges access codes were distributed from government officials/employees to non-government employees, with intent to bully, intimidate and impair the Plaintiff's driving abilities by accessing the mechanics of her automobiles: 2003 Honda Accord, the mechanics of the starter, ignition switch, and transmission.** 2003 Honda Accord: bullying with illegal access to make the Plaintiff, alleges these bullying actions made the Plaintiff late to work or undependable transportation, by utilizing a cutoff-ignition switch, illegal access to the mechanics of the Plaintiff's transmission, Arlington & Fort Worth, Texas 2012-2015. **The Plaintiff alleges the defendant failed to protect her from another single isolated incident with the 2002 Oldsmobile Alero driving on Dexter R**

**Executive Order 12891, January 15, 1994.**

Central Intelligence Community Directive 191

GOVERNING LAWS: Executive Order NO. 12333, Executive Order NO. 12333 (entirety with Amendments, Revisions & Annexes A and B), Executive Order NO. 12333, B 2.10 3 CFR 213(1982),

Cyberspace Stalking, 18 U.S.C. § 875 c, 18 U.S.C. § 2261A:

Cyberstalking Title 18, U.S. Code, Section 2261A Federal Stalking Statue, Section 2261A (1) covering in-person stalking and Section 2261A (2) covering cyberstalking-stalking that has occurred with my internet, phones, mail , bank accounts, Section 2261(2)

The Violence Against Woman Act of 2005-Subsections (A) and (B),

Violence Against Woman Act 1994-4/2019 revised, 18 U.S.C. § Physical Stalking (Governing laws per/State, whereby applicable) concerning other federal jurisdictional and federal government classified boundaries with the Plaintiff

47 U.S.C. § 223 Obscene or harassing telephone calls,

**18 U.S.C. § 2422 (b) Enticement/Coercion of a minor, using my grandchildren to clutch upon a right shoulder and giving them cyberspace access to their grandmother,**

18 U.S.C. § 1030 Computer Hacking, 1030(a)(2)(c), 18 U.S.C. § 1028A(a)(1),  
18 U.S.C. § 2701-2712 and 18 U.S.C. § 3121-3127, and 3127(3), 3127 (4) Amended  
Wire Trap Act, 18 U.S.C. § 2510-2521

**Preservation of Data Records**, 18 U.S.C. § 2703(c), 2703 (f), 18 U.S.C. §  
2510(4)m 2511 (1) (2915), 18 U.S.C. § 2511(2) (c)-(d) 2511 (2)(a)(1), ,

**Conspiracy 18 U.S. Code S371- Conspiracy to commit offense or defraud  
U.S., public, and Obstruction of Justice,**

U.S. Code § 73: 1503, 1505, 1506, 1510, 1511, 1512, 1513,

**Civil Rights: Bill of Rights**, 42 U.S. Code § Chapter 21B

**Freedom of Religion**,

**False Personation** 18 U.S. Code of Federal

Regulations Part 29 protect PCII from public Disclosure,

**40 U.S. Code 1315- Chapter 13, making protected critical infrastructure  
information available,**

Homeland Security Act of 2002. Research and Development Act 2002,

E-Government Act,

**Criminal Trespassing** (Governing laws per/state, whereby applicable  
concerning other federal jurisdictional and federal government classified  
boundaries with the Plaintiff,

**Created and Stored Communications Act (SCA)**,

18 U.S.C. §§ 2701-2712,

**Pen Register & Trap & Trace Statute** 18 U.S.C. §§ 3121-3127, & 3127(3), 3127  
(4),

**Amended Wire Tap Act**, 18 U.S.C. §§ 2510-2521,

Preservation of Data Records **Failure to uphold/implement** 47 U.S.C. §  
4002(a) (2)(B)(2015).

Fair Act Laws

**1955 Clayton Act Laws Section 4B (1), (2), (3)**

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This case is about a “**continual violation**,” of my rights, as a citizen of the United States of America, with “**unauthorized human experimentation**.”

My, Appellant, Charise Logan’s brief introduction to this case is best explained by the following quote, by J. Brian Wagman in his review of John William Sayer, *Ghost Dancing the Law: The Wounded Knee Trials*.

“Sayer states that his account “**is not intended to provide a single truth, or the definitive history of the trials**” (p. 8); instead, he hopes “**to amplify voices from the past and identify the structures and procedures that altered or silenced those voices, both as the events unfolded and over the course of time**” (p. 8).”

J. Brian Wagaman. Review of Sayer, John William, *Ghost Dancing the Law: The Wounded Knee Trials*. H-PCAACA, H-Net Reviews. December, 1998. URL: <http://www.h-net.org/reviews/showrev.php?id=2548>

The voices of victims, such as, the Frank Olson’s family, who The Honorable President Ford apologized to for the **unauthorized testing and human experimenting** with MKULTRA. Again, The Honorable President Bill Clinton apologizing to the victims of “unauthorized testing,” for human experimentation with radiation January 15, 1994.

“When the government does wrong, we have a **moral responsibility to admit it**.”

Cimons, Marlene, Clinton Apologizes for Radiation Test: Experiments: Cabinet will study compensation for some victims and their families. About 4000 Secret Studies Through 1974 Were Disclosed. [Http://latimes.com/burchureslla-xpm=1995-10-04-mn-53213-story.html](http://latimes.com/burchureslla-xpm=1995-10-04-mn-53213-story.html). 4 October 1995. Web. 2 June 2020.

The Appellant, alleges she has been continually victimized with violations of **the Executive Order No. 12333, B 2.10, 3 CFR 213 (1982), and Executive Order No. 12333 in its entirety with Amendments and Annexes by “unauthorized testing,” of the known subject, the Appellant, by the U.S.A. government with MKULTRA and MKOFTEN (another project supplementing MKULTRA)**, which originated from a proposal by Richard Helms, Assistant Deputy Director with our U.S.A. Central Intelligence Agency and approved by Allen Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, April 13, 1953. The Society for the Investigation of Human Ecology, (**the label upon a few blue and green folders, of which The Appellant alleges her Aunty June Merrill Bates utilized to store testing information, upon the Appellant**), was the name of a cover up group, the C.I.A. selected to utilize **for the purpose, of “avoiding exposure” with the civilian human race**.

**“Precautions must be taken not only to protect operations from exposure to enemy forces but also to conceal these activities from the American public in general,” wrote a CIA auditor. “**The knowledge that the agency is engaging in unethical and illicit activities would have serious repercussions in political and diplomatic circles.**”**

Miltimore, J., & Wedler, C. (2019, March 25). 8 Historic Cases That Show The FBI and CIA were out of Control Long Before Russiagate . [Https://fee.org/articles/8-historic-cases-that-show-the-fbi-and-cia-were-out-of-control-long-before-russiagate/](https://fee.org/articles/8-historic-cases-that-show-the-fbi-and-cia-were-out-of-control-long-before-russiagate/). Web. 21 October 2019.

I, the Appellant, Charise Logan, allege, I have suffered from the defendants “collectively engaging” in a “conspiracy to obstruct justice” and “collectively agreeing to fraudulently conceal” the MKULTRA & MKOFTEN continual practices and procedures to the plaintiff and its adverse physical and mental health effects, also imposed upon her family members in and out, of the Appellant’s surrounding atmosphere, just as second hand smoke. The Appellant, alleges she has been monitored from youth and “hasn’t consented,” to numerous “unauthorized testing.”

The Appellant alleges her victimization includes, but isn’t limited to a hidden agenda to “cover up,” the “unauthorized testing,” by several MKUltra and MKOften procedures including electronic equipment surveillance systems and a destructive brainwashing procedure with its hindering purpose to economically/ financially cripple it’s victims, alleged by the Appellant, into submission, by denying them Maslow’s Five Hierarchy Needs, family and social supports systems.

The Appellant, alleges the U.S.A. government is currently, attempting to “cover up” their illegal acts with cyberspace brainwashing video footage played into the atmosphere, while she is alert and asleep. The Appellant, alleges there are multiple daily badgering cyberspace and electronic attacks, which have occurred in eleven different states, of on-going “systematic oppression,” with the U.S.A. government’s attempt to “cover up the damages,” to the Appellant, “the Appellant’s relationship, of genuine trust with her family,” previous social relationships, and x-coworkers, as well as, the Appellant’s Constitutional Rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Additionally, the Appellant alleges the defendants have “collectively conspired to prevent employment opportunities,” needed for sources of income, her livelihood and alleges the defendants have attempted to “paint the perception” to the general public, that the Appellant is an inactive or a lazy person, depressed, auditory dementia and/or with mental issues being taken care of by her family members, with some adult daycare, in her surrounding area at all times.

The Appellant alleges the U.S.A. government, “the defendants”, have manipulated through many active and non-active duty military, as well as, many civilians were “manipulated or coerced” into carrying out bullying and harassing evils, as they attempted to dress up, “their own cover up,” as “a big game,” beginning around the Appellant’s employment time at Walmart, located at: 1801 S. Cooper St., Arlington, Texas. Nevertheless, those multitude of individuals, who The Plaintiff alleges some were lied to “by other individuals” assigned to the “cover up,” allegedly by the defendants (especially the U.S.A. government), just as the solicited universities and private researchers were lied to by the C.I.A. and those other individuals “aren’t targeted,” as defendants, but may become a volunteer witness, subpoenaed, or submit an affidavit, depending upon the U.S.A. governments response to

the complaint, who the Appellant alleges are “at the root,” of this “organized” and “systematic oppression,” of the Appellant’s life.

The Appellant alleges the defendants, especially the U.S.A. government has “intentionally” added insult to injury, by neglecting it’s duty to respond in the appropriate way to many certified mailings, flyers and signs to the public crying out, but alleges they have multiple violations and multiple counts, of those violations, within each day, of her life by continually violating the Executive Order 12333, the Amendments and Annexes, her Constitutional Bill of Rights, Freedom of Religion, Violence Against Women Act, and more federal laws.

“In every State across our nation, stalking is a crime. It is unacceptable behavior that violates the most basic principles of respect and decency, infringing on our fundamental right to feel safe and secure. At some point in their lives, 1 in 6 American women will be stalked. This abuse creates distress and takes a profound toll on its victims and our communities.... Stalking is a serious offense with significant consequences. **It is often detrimental to the physical and emotional well-being of the victim, and some are forced to move or change jobs.** This behavior often escalates over time, and is sometimes followed by sexual assault or homicide.

Addressing this hidden crime is part of my Administration’s comprehensive strategy to combat violence against women, and stalking is one of the four areas addressed by the Violence Against Women Act. When I proudly signed the reauthorization of this historic law, we bolstered many of its provisions, including expanding, safeguards against cyberstalking and protections for immigrants who have been victims of stalking. Across the Federal government, we are building, strong partnerships with those working to break the cycle of the abuse, and we remain dedicated to ending violence against women and men in all its forms.”

Press Release, Office of the Press Secretary, Presidential Proclamation---national Stalking Awareness Month, 2015 (Dec 31, 2014), <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2014/12/31/presidential-proclamation-national-stalking-awareness-month-2015>. Groban, M. S. (2016, May). Intimate Partner Cyberstalking. *Cyber Misbehavior*, 64(3), 13.

The Appellant alleges the defendants have implemented several simultaneous procedures, aimed at an intentional “demoralization and defamation,” of her character, with “intent,” of accomplishing the desired end result, of her “giving up,” the good fight of faith “to live and enjoy life,” cyberspace tormenting with “unauthorized human experimenting designed to ware down the Appellant and send her into premature retirement, or potentially a mental nervous breakdown, Insanity, “sending false perceptions to the public” the Appellant was Auditory Dementia, suffering Depression, Paranoia, Bipolarization, and had HIV I or II by infections and scars from water contamination. These unauthorized experiments were carried out before the public in the Appellant’s residential dwellings, health clubs and work environment, before potential interviewing or observing employers, psychologists, intern psychologists, active and retired military. The Appellant believes all the trauma and hardship caused by the aggressive and persistent numerous violations with

continual “unauthorized testing,” human experimenting in her lifetime is explained by Wikipedia,

**“Although the government aggressively, and sometimes successfully, sought to avoid legal liability, several plaintiffs did receive compensation through court order, out-of-court settlement, or acts of Congress.”**

Project MKUltra. (n.d.). Retrieved May 25, 2019  
from [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Project\\_MKUltra](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Project_MKUltra)

The Appellant alleges all three government branch defendants: **Homeland Security, United States Department of Defense and Central Intelligence Agency** massively failed to comply with **Executive Order No. 12333, 1.3** and alleges numerous counts concerning the **Delegation of authority to the CIA to collect, retain, and disseminate intelligence information concerning U.S. persons in accordance with Procedures** established by the Director of CIA and approved by the Attorney General, “after” consultation with the Director of National Intelligence. The Appellant alleges these three branches, their respective departments and employees, all have knowledge and/or knew to reference distributed typed manuals, electronic manuals and/or their government data bases (software pertaining to laws and instructions) concerning the applicable laws, rules and regulations of the United States Government, for which positions, they are hired and required to uphold.

Additionally, The Plaintiff alleges these three defendants and their respective employees, know and knew, as the three Minnesota police officers, who watched the murder of George Floyd, the procedures for authorization, required permission and the “chain of command,” they must submit to and follow: Director of National Security (5 and 2 acting DNI's) since 2004, U.S. Attorney Generals (numerous employees, over the years of the alleged violations and three, within The Honorable Trump administration, already), and Directors of the Defendants Branches/Departments and Supervisors, which are responsible for the subordinate employees. Because The Plaintiff, is exercising her right to motion and thus, apply 1955 Clayton Act Section 4B, (1), (2), (3) statutes of limitations, begins at discovery of the fraudulent violations. Recognizing the alleged conspiracy to “Fraudulently Conceal,” it is impossible, to zero in upon serving one, individual U.S. Attorney General and 11 different State Attorney Generals, of which The Plaintiff alleges “accountability,” concerning her federal complaint is directed at the defendants, branch of the government, which covers its departments and employees. The Plaintiff alleges due to the fact, these violations have occurred over the years of her lifetime, the “accountability,” becomes enormous with **Executive Order No. 12333, 1.3 delegation of authority to the CIA in accordance with Procedures established by the Director of CIA and approved by the Attorney general, after, consultation with the Director of national Intelligence.**

**2.2 Failing to maintain proper balance with acquisition and protection of individual interest and their constitutional rights,**

**3.3 failure to provide enhanced safeguards,**

**4.4.3 (c) testing and training activities violated without consent,**

(f)(2) CIA activities are limited in extent and duration with use of electronic surveillance equipment

(f)(3) The training or testing activity does not exceed ninety calendar days,

(f)(4) The activities "do not" intentionally target the communications of a particular person,

**9.1,9.2 disclosed participation, 9.3-9.3.2 Undisclosed participation and undisclosed participation requiring particular approvals (written contractual agreements)**

10.1, 10.2 missed check points, of accountability and negligence. The Appellant alleges Homeland Security, The Central Intelligence Agency and The Department of Defense, as well as, their respective employees have massively failed with numerous counts of violating

**Executive Order No. 12333, 2.2, by failing to maintain proper balance between the acquisition of essential information and protection of individual interest and their constitutional rights.** The Appellant alleges numerous counts, of The Defendants allegedly violating the **Executive Order No. 12333, 2.6, by failing to protect "any element," of the Intelligence Community.** (Also U.S. Central Intelligence Community Directive 191: A Duty to Warn)

The Appellant alleges theses three defendants violated Executive Order No. 12333, 3.3 General Principals with numerous counts violating CIA activities shall have a "purpose" consistent with the CIA procedures, authorities and responsibilities of the CIA with any collection procedures and shall collect only the amount of information reasonably necessary to support that purpose. The Appellant, alleges all three branches additionally violated 3.3 with another checks and balances established with the Appellant's constitutional rights by "failure to comply with the Department of Justice to provide enhanced safeguards "beyond those specifically set forth" in any authorized purpose and collection procedure.

Additional safeguards, that can be implemented based upon one or more of the following individual classifications: the U.S. person, to whom which information is being collected is significant in volume (the magnitude of collection procedures or counteractions during the Appellant watching sports or her work environment in the AT&T Stadium), proportion (the magnitude of collection procedures or counteractions during more than one sport activity or multiple sports: Football, Basketball, Hockey, Major League Baseball, Soccer, Golf, & Tennis overlapping within a season), sensitivity (controlling harassers, distractors, rest of the Appellant, and volume of the electronic megahertz implemented into her atmosphere (residential or automobile), as allegedly known & recorded information within the defendants archives, comparing tolerable shock to humans with scientific studies of electrical shock to mice) and/or "failed to enhance safeguards," with the observation of the U.S. persons fourth amendment and their "reasonable privacy."

The Appellant alleges all three defendants violated Executive Order No. 4.4.3 (c)

The CIA undertakes the testing and training activities violated without consent, (d)

The CIA directs the testing and training activities against "live signals"

environments, local and recorded abroad. The Appellant alleges other recruited civilians, active and non-active duty military, and even her own family were trained to utilize electronic surveillance.

**NOTICE, "THE INTERROGATION ROOM," UTILIZED BY C.I.A. TO WATERBOARD ABU ZUBAYDAH AND HOSPITAL ROOMS UTILIZED BY C.I.A. FOR "SECRET UNAUTHORIZED TESTING," WITH RADIATION... MOVED FROM THE GOVERNMENTS FACILITIES WITH ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT & BRAINWASHING VIDEO'S INTO... THE APPELLANT'S WORKING AND LIVING ENVIRONMENT'S, AS WELL AS, HER AUTOMOBILE.**

The Appellant alleges the three major U.S. government defendants and others to whom they trained and manipulated through, as the original private contracted universities, have and are yet, inseminating mental torment, previous recorded videos and/or videos of previous abuse with her mother's illness vomiting blood and Necrophilia with the Appellant's mother's body, video footage of sexual abuse with the Appellant's young adult children, family, and impersonators were and still are played in the atmosphere, of the Appellant for acts of fear, intimidation, and brainwashing, which can be proven by witness testimony, affidavits and/or polygraphs.

(f)(2) The activities are "limited in extent" and "duration" to those necessary to train personnel in the use of electronic surveillance equipment and to determine the capability and performance of that equipment,

(f)(3) The training or testing activity does not exceed ninety calendar days,

(f)(4) The activities do not intentionally target the communications of a particular person,

The Appellant alleges in 11 different states, the defendant's activities "targeted her," 4.4.3 (f) (4) during her working hours at numerous jobs, leisure time watching professional and non-professional sports and places of worship,

(f)(6) Information derived from communications intercepted in the course of the activities is not retained or disclosed "to any person" other than a person "directly" participating in such activity (such as trainees and their instructors, not the public, clergy, nor retired military persons, which has overlapping violations in addition to:

(f) (6) of False Personation 18 U.S. Code of Federal Regulations Part 29 protect PCII from public Disclosure, (Defendant Wendy Logan, on camera breaking Homeland Security laws beside The Honorable Michelle Obama, and coercion of minors (Appellant's grandchildren, Malayah and Darien to call her Nana) at AT & T Stadium, Legends employee, during Cowboys NFL games) 40 U.S. Code 1315- Chapter 13, making protected critical infrastructure information available and any printout or other recording is destroyed before or immediately upon completion of the activity or in the case of training, as soon as, reasonably possible,

(f)(7) The training is approved "in writing" by the "responsible Head of Directorate" or Mission Center or "designee" with the concurrence of the General Counsel, based on their determinations that the particular training or testing program "conforms to these Procedures" and is. "otherwise lawful." No testing of electronic surveillance equipment inside the United States may exceed "ninety calendar days," without the prior approval of the Attorney General. The Appellant alleges all three defendants: Homeland Security, Central Intelligence Agency, and U.S. Department of Defense "failed," to return in writing or by telephone, any correspondence (except the U.S. Department of Justice in 2010, after reporting Attorney Denise Valini of Olgatree, Deacons & Associates for allegedly "failing to disclose" and "obstruction of justice," which was a redirected letter of responsibility, so I filed my complaint with The State of Texas, State Bar) bring into "accountability identified violators," when the government defendants, became aware of the electronic surveillance abuse and outright intentionally, broke the law with the

**Executive Order No. 12333 and its entirety, amendments and annexes, when the violators and/or the Countermeasure procedures acted with or without consent of Executive Order No. 12333,**

**4.4.4 Countermeasures related to electronic surveillance equipment.** The Appellant alleges all three defendants violated 4.3.3 in United States, Canada, and Aruba Island with standard collection techniques to conduct communications security investigations, physical security investigations, or personnel security investigations without approvals within the established Procedures, except that the use of concealed monitoring techniques require General Counsel concurrence and The Appellant alleges more approvals were violated for her travels out of the country in April 1993.

The Appellant, "reserves the right to amend this complaint," under discovery for any alleged violations, with the three defendants of Executive Order 4.4.1 Special Collection Techniques with "outsourcing and/or delegation," with collection techniques to: the Dallas F.B.I., Chicago F.B.I. and any public, corporate or sole proprietor entities hired or assigned under "confidential contracts," rather considered or classified as an Central Intelligence Element, or not. The Appellant reserves the right with discovery for any violations with Executive Order No. 12333, 5 Approval and Documentation Requirements for Bulk and Certain Other Collection Activities.

The Appellant alleges violations with all three defendants with **Executive Order No. 7. Retention of Information Concerning U.S. Persons,**

**Section 8 Dissemination of Information Concerning U.S. Persons,**

**8.1 Dissemination inside the Intelligence Community,**

**8.2 Dissemination outside the Intelligence Community,**

**Section 9. Participation in Organizations in the United States, whereby the Appellant alleges other defendants were recruited, trained and coerced into conducting "duly authorized" intelligence activities, those acting on behalf of the**

**CIA may participate in organizations in the United States only in accordance with the Procedures.**

**9.1 Applicability, 9.2 Disclosed participation, 9.3-9.3.2 Undisclosed participation and undisclosed participation “requiring particular approvals.”** The Appellant alleges there are numerous violations and numerous counts of the violations compounded within the CIA and overlapping with Homeland Security and Department of Defense with

**Executive Order No. 10 Compliance and Oversight Responsibilities: 10.1 Compliance, 10.2.1-2.6 Oversight responsibilities.** Appellant alleges the Defendants additionally failed to protect her and other potentially endangered citizens of the public, by inappropriate access to the functions of the automobiles: 2003 Honda Accord and 2002 Oldsmobile Alero she was driving on several occasions.

**42 U.S. Code § 1985, (1), (2) Obstructing Justice intimidating a party(Plaintiff), witness, juror, (3) conspiring to go in disguise or on the highway or the premises of another, for the purpose of depriving, either directly or indirectly a person of the equal protection, constitutional rights),**

Appellant alleges the Defendant failed to protect from illegal access to cyberspace control of the Appellant personal automobile, whereby the Appellant alleges access codes were distributed from government officials/employees to non-government employees, with intent to bully, intimidate and impair the Appellant's driving abilities by accessing the mechanics of her automobiles: 2003 Honda Accord, the mechanics of the starter, ignition switch, and transmission. 2003 Honda Accord: bullying with illegal access to make the Appellant, alleges these bullying actions made the Appellant late to work or undependable transportation, by utilizing a cutoff-ignition switch, illegal access to the mechanics of the Appellant's transmission, Arlington & Fort Worth, Texas 2012-2015. The Appellant alleges the defendant failed to protect her from another single isolated incident with the 2002 Oldsmobile Alero driving on Dexter Rd., Germantown, TN. 2/2019, when the steering wheel was jerked back to the left from the right edge of the road, during the daylight hours.

The Appellant alleges the three government branches Homeland Security, Central Intelligence Agency and U. S. Department of defense have numerous violations and several counts, on a daily basis covering the following location (s): sleeping area(s) family residence, own apartment, and hotels, several employment environment(s), which were made a “playground” to exploit the Appellant and carry out numerous violations, places of worship, and a casual trip to the grocery store or local gas station (especially, Pilot & Loves gas stations during highway travels to shower).

The Appellant filed her complaint 3:19 CV 01908 August 9, 2019 with over 600 exhibits. (543?) The Appellant amended her complaint with corrections and more exhibits August 13, 20, and 27, 2019. The Honorable Magistrate Judge Rutherford filed a judicial review October 14, 2019 with no explanation of how or why the Appellant's case was randomly selected for review and suggested complaint 3:19 CV 01908 be dismissed by applying with prejudice 28 U.S.C. § 1915 (e) (2). On October 22, 2019 the Appellant, Charise Logan filed an objection to The Honorable Magistrate Judge Rutherford's review. On October 22, 2019 The Honorable Judge Barbara Lynn upheld the judicial review of the Honorable Magistrate Judge Rutherford and

dismissed complaint 3:19 CV 01908. The Appellant, Charise L. Logan timely filed her Notice of Appeal, November 4, 2019 and timely amended her Notice of Appeal, November 5, 2019.

The Appellant, Charise Logan drove to Louisiana Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals and was shown 17 of the 27 defendants were absent from the caption. The Appellant, motioned (**providing printed proof in exhibits, of the original complaint listing all 27**), the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, to compel the North Dallas District Courts, to fix the caption, 02/21/20. The Appellant was told to go back to the North Dallas District Courts and her motion was denied, 02/28/20. The Appellant went back directly to North Dallas District Courts, who partially fixed the caption, **but wouldn't fix three new defendants**, which were added in The Honorable Magistrates Rebecca Rutherford's Judicial Review 10/08/20, **however, were not included as defendants in the "original filing paper work."** The Appellant, couldn't get the lower courts to change the three new defendants, back to the original three, so, I filed my Briefs with acceptance by Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals management team clerk, **giving exception to the original caption, not the mysterious additional three new defendants**, U.S. Army Signal Corps, U.S. Marine Corps., and City of Grand Prairie along with my Record Excerpts, March 12, 2020. On April 24, 2020 Counsel of The Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in Louisiana upheld North Dallas District Courts, Honorable Judge Barbara Lynn's "Frivolous," Judgment of October 22, 2019.

This Appeal case **primary focus is upon the importance and necessity, of the Appellant, Charise L. Logan being denied her "voice to be heard for justice and accountability," as the "silenced" voices in the Wounded Knee trials**, by granting her complaint with over 600 exhibits and witness testimony in a court of law, to prove her alleged claims concerning her victimization, by U.S. Central Intelligence Agency's MKULTRA and MKOFTEN, as well as, the other defendants, who had previous knowledge of the Appellant, or became informed and looked the other way, as the three Minnesota Police Officers during the murder of George Floyd, yet, others, became a defendant for allowing such "unauthorized human experimentation," in the workplace, as a "playground," or "interrogation room," for continual ongoing "unauthorized testing" in human experimentation. III. Statement of Claims, ROA. 19-11208.21.42, 19-11208.43:1-9. IV. Relief, 19-11208.268-276.

## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, Louisiana, as The North Dallas District Courts erred to honor the Appellant's Civil Right to be heard in a court of law, **with living witnesses to support her alleged claims** within her complaint 3:19 CV 01908 with 1092 documents forwarded to The Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. The Appellant, Plaintiff, "didn't fail" to provide:

A. **Reasonable presentation of facts and governing laws for an arguable basis.** III.

Statement of Claims, ROA. 19-11208.21- 195. Objection to Judicial Review, 10/21/2019 ROA. 19-11208.967-968:1-2. Notice of Appeal, 11/4/2019, ROA. 19-11208.988-1036. Exhibits: OBJ 1, OBJ 2, OBJ 3. ROA. 19-11208.983-985.

B. **History, Why? 28 U.S.C. § 1915 (e), (2) wasn't applicable to this complaint:**

Notice of Appeal, 11/4/2019, ROA. 19-11208.988-992. **Federal governing laws,** III. Statement of Claims, R.O.A. 19-11208.40:12-20, 19-11208.41, 19-11208.42: 1-13. IV. Relief, R.O.A. 19-11208.268-277 and **case law opposing the misapplication of 28 U.S.C. § 1915 (e), (2), Objection to Judicial Review** 10/21/2019, ROA. 19-11208.967:15-20, 19-11208.970, 19-11208.972:1-4, Notice of Appeal, 11/4/2019, ROA. 19-11208.1000. Additionally, "**expert opinion,**" **opposing the misapplication of 28 U.S.C. § 1915 (e), (2),** mentioning "with the most liberal consideration," (p.3) Objection to Judicial Review 10/21/2019, ROA. 19-11208.978:11-19, 19-11208.979:1-18, 19-11208.980:6-8.

C. **Defendants weren't exempt** from the Appellant, Plaintiff, petitioned relief, within complaint 3:19 CV 01908, IV. Relief, ROA. 19:11208.268-279. **Objection to Judicial Review 10/21/2019, ROA. 19-11208.977:7-20, 19-11208.978:1-11.** Notice of Appeal, 11/4/2019, R.O.A. 19-11208.997: 16-20, 19-11208.998-1000.

North Dallas District Courts Honorable Magistrate Judge Rutherford judicial review refers to the Appellant's complaint, with a false accusation of having "malice," and clearly, overlooked Exhibits listed within IV. Relief, p. 42:6-18, Arlington I.S.D. et... all, a notarized letter 2015 of "mercy and forgiveness," to students and more, who had been deceived to participate in what was labeled "A Big Game," or "Experiment" and asked them to inform the students, not to do so, anymore. Thus, many of those students have graduated, whereby the Defendants, "who weren't summoned for testimony," allegedly have broken on more than one account, numerous times, the federal jurisdictional law 18 U.S.C. § 2422 (b) **Enticement/ Coercion of a minor,** as the Appellant, Plaintiff, offered "facts," within her III. Statement of Claims, ROA. 19-11208.21-195. **Some of the students gently whispered to me, an apology, while passing me in the Arlington Mall or a restaurant and recently, in March 2020, upon the parking lot of a shopping mall in Orlando, Florida.** (Diverse High School, College, Professional, and Little League sports teams to international Soccer and Olympic Teams having knowledge of the Appellant)

According to The Honorable Judge Barbara Lynn, she stated, the Appellant, the Notice to Appeal,

As the public had an outburst with the response of Dre Bre's concerning the publics responses and reactions, to the death of George Floyd, not fully grasping, nor understanding

**the depth of years of numerous sufferings and injustice with African Americans, parables with the lower courts “making light of” the Appellant’s complaint violations of her civil rights, conspiracy, CIA 90 days limit of testing and not targeting “one,” test subject with stipulations for respecting reasonable privacy, calling numerous violations, “Frivolous?”**

The lower courts overlooked the Appellant’s “**Tangible Faith**,” efforts to keep numerous certified mailings and fax confirmations, since 2011 to authorities, submitted within over 600 exhibits (543?). Additionally, these exhibits included worded t-shirts, a coat, testimony standing in the public with poster demonstrations **for years, in all weather conditions**, throughout the DFW area, from the public sidewalks upon the side entrance of the Arlington Police Department located on Division, to the overpasses/ bridges between 7:30 a.m.-10:30 a.m. during morning traffic jams upon 360 Highway between Arlington, Fort Worth and Grand Prairie, Texas.

**The signs were “purposed to bring awareness,” to continual bullying and systematic oppression through “unauthorized human experimenting,” as well as, authorities continual overlooking injustice, while allowing federal crimes, to become a “norm” with the Appellant, within her community and other states, the Appellant relocated. These were efforts to keep my cry, in the public eye, such as the movie “Three Billboards of Ebbing Missouri.” Additionally, there are Exhibits, submitted at the lower courts, “**showing a hat**,” which I wore in 2013 at Wal-Mart, during working hours letting coworkers and the public know, “No Big Game,” “No More Test.”**

Yet, The Honorable Judge Barbara Lynn, believes the Appellant, didn’t file her appeal “**in good faith.**”

The Honorable Bill Clinton shared his evaluation of the “unauthorized human experimentation” with the radiation test wasn’t represented in “**good faith**,” **to Americans** with this quote, some of the experiments performed during that period “were unethical not only by today’s standards but by the standards of the time. They failed both the test of our national values and the test of humanity.”

Cimons, Marlene, Clinton Apologizes for Radiation Test: Experiments: Cabinet will study compensation for some victims and their families. About 4,000 Secret Studies Through 1974 Were Disclosed. <http://latimes.com/burnhireslla-xpm=1995-10-04-mn-53213-story.html>. 4 October 1995, Web. 2 June 2020.

C.I.A. investigations proved the interrogation actions, of “unauthorized,” human experimenting “waterboarding,” Abu Zubaydah weren’t in “good faith.” “In the past, the Obama administration has argued against pursuing criminal prosecutions of those responsible for the CIA torture programme on grounds that they were operating in “good faith” within the legal parameters set by the Office of Legal Counsel at the time. But the letter to Holder argues that the new material contained in the Senate report reveals the perpetrators knew very well that the interrogation techniques were illegal and sought reassurance from the DOJ that they would not be prosecuted.”

Pikington, Ed. “Human Rights Groups Call for Special Prosecutor to Investigate CIA Torture.” <Https://www.theguardian.com/law/2014/dec/22/aclu-human-rights-watch-ask-eric-holder-prosecute-cia-torture>. The Guardian, 22 December 2014. Web. 20 May 2020, p. 2

“Ironically, the only part of the CIA’s torture program in which agency officials claimed they were hamstrung by prohibitions on human experimentation is when they were asked by Senante investigations if torture was effective.” Harvard’s Raymond, using the agency’s acronym for its “enhanced interrogation technique” euphemism, said the CIA must have known its guidelines on human experimentation ruled out its psychologist-designed brutal interrogations.”

Aekerman, Spencer. "Human Rights Groups Call for Special Prosecutor to Investigate CIA Torture." [Https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2015/jun/15/cia-torture-human-experimentation-doctors](https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2015/jun/15/cia-torture-human-experimentation-doctors). The Guardian, 15 June 2015. Web. 20 May 2020, p. 6

“Experts assessing the document for the Guardian said the human-experimentation guidelines were critical to understanding the CIA’s baseline view of the limits of its medical research- limits they said the agency and its medical personnel violated during its interrogations, detentions and renditions program after 9/11.”

Ibid. Aekerman, Spencer. The Guardian, 15 June 2015, p. 4

“After reviewing the document, one watchdog said the timeline suggested the CIA manipulated basic definitions of human experimentation to ensure the torture program proceeded. Crime one was torture. The second crime was research without consent in order to say it wasn’t torture,” said Nathaniel Raymond, a former war-crimes investigator with Physicians for Human Rights and now a researcher with Harvard University’s Humanitarian Initiative.”

Ibid. Aekerman, Spencer. The Guardian, 15 June 2015, p. 2

“Steven Aftergood, a scholar of the intelligence agencies with the Federation of American Scientists, suggested that the agency might need to study polygraph effects on its agents; evaluate their performance under conditions of stress; or study physiological indicators of deception. But all said that such examples of human experimentation would require something that the CIA never had during the interrogation program: the informed consent of its subjects.”

Ibid. Aekerman, Spencer. The Guardian, 15 June 2015, p. 5

As Steven Aftergood suggested polygraphs to agents within the CIA to evaluate their levels of integrity and deception with upholding the laws upon human experimentation, the following quote, by Attorney Dror Ladin shows the manipulation of “truth and justice,” by several government offices and positions within our government: our Honorable Bush, Commander In Chief’s administration attorneys, CIA’s General Council, Justice Department Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR) and Justice Department of Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR).

“In response to an ACLU Freedom of Information Act lawsuit, the government has released several documents that shed new light on Bush administration lawyers’ attempts to evade the absolute prohibition on torture and abuse of prisoners. The documents concern the widely-discredited legal process that purported to authorize the CIA...

One revelation is an email by John Rizzo, the CIA's acting general counsel, which displays the ways in which government lawyers actively undermined the laws they were sworn to uphold. Rizzo, a key architect of the torture program, has claimed, “[M]y major concern as the chief lawyer was: Were these techniques legal?”

But in a Justice Department Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR) report containing a secret 2003 email, Rizzo revealed his disdain for international human rights treaties like the Geneva Conventions as well as his confidence that the Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel (OLC) would find a way to undermine them:

Rizzo replied, “Applying pressure to [name withheld].”

It's hard to read Rizzo's email as anything other than a cynical acknowledgment of government lawyers' willingness to subvert the law.”

Ladin, Dror. In Secret Email, CIA's Chief Lawyer Mocked 'Pesky Little International Obligations. [Https://www.aclu.org/blog/national-security/torture/secret-email-cias-chief-lawyer-mocked-pesky-little-international](https://www.aclu.org/blog/national-security/torture/secret-email-cias-chief-lawyer-mocked-pesky-little-international) Web. 21 July 2016, 6 July 2020.

Will this U.S. Supreme Courts be manipulated to “undermine,” the “truth,” by affirming the lower courts, “Frivolous,” judgment to avoid the Appellant having the platform in a court of law to prove the “truth,” of her complaint and the “systems and structures,” avoiding her attempts with numerous certified mailings, etc... to “find out the Clayton cause of action,” which attempted silenced her voice, as the injustices surrounding The Wounded Knee Trials? The Appellant, provided three exhibits from The Crowley Files, (bless his soul to have hidden, then given these truths to the American public, knowing the CIA, destroyed MKULTRA documents 1974) confirming her Statement of Claims, of the men utilized to inflict her life with MKULTRA and my responses to it. Another missed opportunity of the lower courts to grant a trial with living witnesses to her complaint with “unauthorized human experimenting,” and another missed opportunity with upholding the governing law, the Appellant submitted was violated with her, Preservation of Data Records, 18 U.S.C. § 2703 (c), 2703 (f), 18 U.S.C. § 2510 (4m), 2511 (1) (2915), 18 U.S.C. § 2511 (2) (c) – (d) 2511 (2) (a) (1)

“Rizzo later claimed that his email “clearly appears to be an off-the-cuff, jocular remark.” But it's only a joke because the OLC's approval of torture was a farce: Its lawyers decided, in Rizzo's words, to “interpret over, under and around” the law. “

Ibid. Ladin, Dror. In Secret Email, CIA's Chief Lawyer Mocked 'Pesky Little International Obligations. Web 21 July 2016.

To the Counsel of The U.S. Supreme Courts, my coworkers, were told to treat it like a “Big Game,” and by x-military, as “Just Good Humor.” I provided two polygraphs in my exhibits proving this “conspiracy,” to fraudulently conceal the cause of action and more. Additionally, I provided four pages of license plates upon the parking lot of my job at Wal-Mart including military license plates and government officials came with their fire truck and ambulance escorts. Allegedly, pressure by the C.I.A. came to all the Commander In Chiefs,

Honorable Judges, Federal, State, and Local Authorities hands, I would be observed by or passed through, as the public looked upon me, **bringing awareness to their unauthorized human experimentation, recruiting people to systematically oppress my life, liberty and pursuit of happiness, while ostracizing my life, as prisoner fighting against a beast, for my life in a Roman Empire Arena, before the multitude...** therefore, desensitizing the American Public, who also knew it was wrong, at the same time instilling fear within each individual American or visitor, “It could have been me,” lyrics to a gospel song, by Kirk Franklin.

“OLC’s work was so flawed that a government lawyer who played a key role in initially authorizing torture later denounced it. In 2002, John Bellinger, who was then legal advisor to the National Security Council, played a key role in the authorization for torture and abusive methods from the OLC. Bellinger later told investigators that “there was ‘pressure’ from the CIA from the outset to approve the program.”

Ibid. Ladin, Dror. In Secret Email, CIA’s Chief Lawyer Mocked ‘Pesky Little International Obligations. Web 21 July 2016.

**How did 5<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court of Appeals fail to apply LA Rev Stat § 14:87.2 (2016) and find an arguable basis with the Appellant’s complaint, State of Declaration, Options within the Record Excerpts, and over 600 (543?) Exhibits? Was the 5<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court of Appeals pressured by the CIA?**

#### **§87.2. Human experimentation**

A. Human experimentation is the use of any live born human being, without consent of that live born human being, as hereinafter defined, for any scientific or laboratory research or any other kind of experimentation or study except to protect or preserve the life and health of the live born human being, or the conduct, on a human embryo or fetus in utero, of any experimentation or study except to preserve the life or to improve the health of the human embryo or fetus.

<https://law.justia.com/codes/louisiana/2016/code-revisedstatutes/title-14/rs-14-87.2>. Web. 6 July 2020.

The Appellant, Charise L. Logan can prove with witness testimony the CIA’s **interrogation and torture room, became “mobile,”** wherever the Appellant went from her automobile, residence, health clubs, employment, leisure watching sports games and church in Texas, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Minnesota. More proof, of our U.S. government through the hands of the CIA and **CIA safehouses set up outside our country, as well as, a manipulative “unauthorized human experiment,” with Frank Olson’s history and his reaction to “unauthorized human experimentation,” of LSD slipped into his drink, as well as, CIA “safehouses” and “communities” he traveled to and observed the deaths of many.**

“In CIA safe-houses in Germany,” according to one study, “Olson witnessed horrific brutal interrogations on a regular basis. Detainees who were deemed ‘expendable’ – suspected spies or moles, security leaks, etc – were

literally interrogated to death in experimental methods combining drugs, hypnosis and torture, to attempt to master brainwashing techniques and memory erasing.”

“Several, including Olson, drank heartily. After 20 minutes, Gottlieb asked if anyone was feeling odd. Several said they were. Gottlieb then told them their drinks had been spiked with LSD.

The news was not well received. Even in their altered state, the subjects could understand what had been done to them. Olson was especially upset.

By this time MK-Ultra had been under way for seven months. It was one of the government's deepest secrets, guarded by security that was, as Olson had been told when he joined the special operations division, “tighter than tight”. Barely two dozen men knew its true nature. Nine had been at Deep Creek Lake. Several of those had been surreptitiously dosed with LSD. Now one of them seemed out of control. This was no light matter for men who believed that the success or failure of MK-Ultra might determine the fate of the US, and all humanity.

Olson had spent 10 years at Fort Detrick and knew most, if not all, of the special operation division's secrets. He had repeatedly visited Germany and brought home pictures from Heidelberg and Berlin, where the US military maintained clandestine interrogation centres. He was one of several special operations division scientists who were in France on 16 August 1951, when an entire French village, Pont-Saint-Esprit, was mysteriously seized by mass hysteria and violent delirium that afflicted more than 200 residents and caused several deaths; the cause was later determined to have been poisoning by ergot, the fungus from which LSD was derived.”

Kinzer, Stephen, From Mind Control To Murder? How A Deadly fall Reveals The CIA's Darkest Secrets. [Https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2019/sep/06/from-mind-control-to-murder-how-a-deadly-fall-revealed-the-cias-darkest-secrets](https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2019/sep/06/from-mind-control-to-murder-how-a-deadly-fall-revealed-the-cias-darkest-secrets). Web. 6 September 2019, 3 July 2020.

Thus, interrogation rooms, don't have to be upon federal clearance grounds, nor federal buildings, [i.e. unauthorized radiation test 1974] once, monitoring individuals recruited to cover up the truth, working with the CIA and other government entities, detains an individual through denial of human resources (unemployment financially cripples one, immobilizes one, to an extent without finances), independent transportation (abilities to commute to a library, employment center, recreational park, church or food/supplies mission center) and Maslow's Five Hierarchy Needs. Detaining to “isolate,” to set up CIA safehouses around it's victims or prey, in this complaint, The Appellant, to torment into submission or break one, pursuing restitution for violations of their human, civil, constitutional rights and executive order 12333 it's amendments and annexes.

The agencies excuse for MKULTRA [471 U.S. 159, 174] was that other countries were developing and implementing new advanced programs in brain washing and interrogation techniques.

U.S. Supreme Court, **CIA v. SIMS, 471 U.S. 159 (1985) 471 U.S. 159 CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY ET AL. v. SIMS ET AL. CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT No. 83-1075. Argued December 4, 1984 Decided April 16, 1985 \***  
[Https://archive.is/20121227172157/http://laws.findlaw.com/us/471/159.html#selection-401.1-2475.74](https://archive.is/20121227172157/http://laws.findlaw.com/us/471/159.html#selection-401.1-2475.74) (p.13)

According to the “Entries,” within our U.S. constitution entitled to all “Native born African Americans,” as the Appellant, born unto Barbara Lynne Graves, it is a reasonable cause to grant the petition, based upon my service to this countries advancements in Homeland security, United States Department of Defense instruments of warfare and counter protections, as well as, the CIA’s discovery (during the Appellants youth - adolescence) and perfection of new technologies (with unauthorized human experimentation, after 18 years old via, my legal guardian’s contract). I the Appellant, have been trespassed and violated with existing governing laws filed within, this complaint, which is by no means.... Frivolous.

Summarizing **five** reasons to grant the Appellant’s appeal are: **an arguable basis in fact and law, were established** with:

- 1) **Unauthorized human experimentation**, and governing laws incorporating Executive Order 12333 Amendments and Annexes.
- 2) **Cyberspace crimes** with illegal access to the Appellants atmosphere and privacy. Cyberspace Stalking, 18 U.S.C. § 875 c, 18 U.S.C. § 2261A: Cyberstalking Title 18, U.S. Code, Section 2261A Federal Stalking Statue, Section 2261A (1) covering in-person Stalking and Section 2261A (2) covering cyberstalking-stalking that has occurred with my internet, phones, mail, bank accounts, Section 2261(2)
- 3) **False Personation**, 18 U.S.C. § 43 (911) with a multitude of witnesses at my job within AT&T Stadium home of the Dallas Cowboys, “on camera” during the Washington Redskins game breaking federal jurisdiction “Homeland,” National Security Laws with Wendy Logan (a defendant) impersonating me, beside Michelle Obama, with my daughter and grandchildren, who were asked to call her, “Nana” and “collectively agreeing” to conspire, to “fraudulently conceal” a matter. View: Polygraph: 19-11208.833-836. Conspiracy 18 U.S. Code S371- Conspiracy to commit offense or defraud U.S., public and Obstruction of Justice, U.S. Code § 73: 1503,1505,1506,1510, 1511,1512,1513, **False Personation** 18 U.S. Code of Federal Regulations Part 29 protect PCII from public Disclosure
- 4) **Appellant**, supplied the lower courts with over **600 Exhibits to Federal, State and Local Authorities**, thus, fulfilling the “**Section 4B of the Clayton Act** provides a four-year statute of limitation for all civil antitrust actions brought under the Act.<sup>1</sup> The doctrine of fraudulent concealment, however, allows courts to toll this statute of limitation when the defendant conceals the acts giving rise to the cause of action. This doctrine prevents wrongdoers from unfairly using statutes of limitation to escape sanction. Although the judiciary originally created this exception for fraud actions, <sup>2</sup> the Supreme Court later expanded the doctrine to be “read into every federal statute of limitation.”<sup>3</sup> In antitrust cases, courts have required that the plaintiff plead and prove three elements in order to toll the statute of limitation: (1) the defendant concealed the conduct that constitutes the cause of action; (2) the defendant’s concealment prevented the plaintiff from discovering the cause of action; and (3) the plaintiff exercised “due diligence” in attempting to discover the cause of action.” After ignored letters to the Director of Secret Service, Julia Peirson and several

authorities, celebrities and clergy, The Appellant, went to hold a sign by the gates of the White House in Washington, D.C.

- 5) **Failure of the lower courts,** overlooking, after utilizing any informational search engines within the U.S. Appeal Court jurisdiction, nor U.S. District Court jurisdictional legal laws of discovery, to validate the Plaintiff, Charise L. Logan, as "a citizen" of the U.S.A. and therefore, any codes and association with the Department of Veterans Affairs, Appendix J (Exhibit 19-11208.958) CIA, etc... which will show up in the federal and state information system verifying the Plaintiff's, Appellant's government status.

Richard F. Schwed, Fraudulent Concealment, Self-Concealing Conspiracies, and the Clayton Act, 91 MICH.L. REV. 2259 (1993). [Https://repository.law.umich.edu/mlr/vol91/iss8/19](https://repository.law.umich.edu/mlr/vol91/iss8/19) Web. 2 July 2020.

## CONCLUSION

Quoting from Appendix A, the Summary Calendar, Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, pg. 2,

I. "She further claimed that the defendants use cyberspace to monitor her location with the intent to inject her with certain medical issues and conditions such as diabetes, memory loss, herpes, and HIV."

The Appellant, graduating Class of 1998 at Western Michigan University with a Bachelors Degree in Business Administration, emphasis Management, who accomplished this with the weight of being a single mother, with three children (twins, within the three) and no child support graduating with a 2.74 g.p.a. on a 4. Scale, as well as, an incomplete Masters degree in Healthcare Administration, doesn't understand how the word selection "inject," was retrieved and twisted from the complaints wording, "insemination."

"Injection," of medical issues and conditions requires "penetration," of an individual, such as oral dosage of a polio vaccine, "penetration" or puncture of the skin, such as immunization shot, and/or cut of the skin, to perform a heart transplant.

"Insemination," by cyberspace electronic equipment doesn't require a "physical contact," to another human being, but "proximity." Making "Insemination," tangible is like "aroma," of chocolate chip cookies baking or grilling a steak. The "nose" can smell the "aroma," inseminated into the atmosphere without physically touching or "injecting," the food into the nose. An "ear," can feel the cyber radiation (insemination) of a cell phone, simultaneously, while discerning low and high volumes of sound (injected) into the earlobe traveling through the ear canal to the eardrum.

Referring to the "electronic equipment" exhibit 19-11208. 419 utilized upon the Appellant, for MKUltra and established a history of numerous experiments with recorded results, including "proximity, volume and megahertz level of transferring radio/ electrode activity, which influence and/or manipulate the responses and behaviors of the Appellant, archived by the CIA and it's living employees, as well as, living contracted testers... as mice are manipulated in scientific test, by electrode stimulation to crawl through a maze, turn left or right, etc... isn't "Frivolous." The Appellant alleges the U.S. government and CIA have been quite aggressively sneaky placing electronic equipment in proximity, of the Appellant hidden in attics, surrounding apartments, roofs of apartments, roofs of buildings or rotating the electronic equipment to an undercover or disguised commercial vans, upon the parking lots, as trailers of electronic equipment for a Super Bowl to transfer "electronic stimulation," via cyberspace "access," to influence, affect and long term effect the Appellant. This "IS NOT" "Frivolous," and the Appellant, can and will prove this "access," with "witness," testimony.

"When the government does wrong, we have a moral responsibility to admit it," Clinton said. The duty we owe to one another to tell the truth and to protect our fellow citizens from accesses like these is one we can never walk away from."

25

Cimons, Marlene, Clinton Apologizes for Radiation Test: Experiments: Cabinet will study compensation for some victims and their families. About 4,000 Secret Studies Through 1974 Were Disclosed. <http://latimes.com/burchureslla-xpm=1995-10-04-mn-53213-story.html>. Los Angeles Times. 4 October 1995, Web. 2 June 2020.

**Note: The word “accesses.” How can the lower courts call this “Frivolous” and deny the Appellant the opportunity to prove these “accesses,” which were “unauthorized” “access” violations of the law, admitted by a Commander In Chief, The Honorable Bill Clinton, without witness testimony?**

From the multitude of federal, state, and local authorities informed of these “accesses,” illegal violations of the law, upon numerous occasions without investigation or appropriate follow up, by phone or a written response to the by the Appellant, documented and submitted to the lower courts... United States law requires that those who deprive any person of rights and privileges protected by the constitution of the United States provided by state law be liable in action at law, suit in equity, or other appropriate measure. A private party may be liable under 42 U.S.C.A. §1983 for conspiring with state actors to deprive a citizen of their civil rights. *Keko v. Hingle*, 318 D.3d 639 C.A.5 (La.) 2003’ *Dennis v. Sparks*, 449 U.S. 24 (U.S., 1980).

“She further alleged that various individuals impersonated her to deceive the public regarding her mental health condition.” Summary Calendar (p. 3)

There isn’t any mention of an existing “mental health condition,” by the Appellant, within her complaint, nor was there any mental health examination given, by an order of the lower courts to determine the mental capacity, of the Appellant to represent herself, in a court of law. The Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals enters a somewhat slanderous and/or misleading the public “regarding her mental health condition,” and which should have utilized the optional vocabulary word selections, as I.Q., Competency, or another option word to communicate “normal comprehension” capacity.

The explanation of, as well as, the effects of those victimized by MKULTRA and MKOFTEN, “without witness testimony and/or demonstration,” I can understand, by one’s perception and/or “lack of” actual experience “may appear” fanciful, fantastic, and delusional” or “that could rise up to the level of irrational or wholly incredible,” *Id*, at 33, 28 U.S.C. § 1915 (e), (2) Honorable Magistrate Rutherford Judicial Review, 10/4/2019, (p. 3).

Let’s, Bring it home and make the connection...Here’s where the mistake of not honoring “witness testimony,” is even more important, as with the expert opinion concerning unexplainable things, which can be proven by demonstration, video footage capturing the “cause – reaction,” “stimuli – response,” or natural phenomenon, as The father of Ufology, Phillip J. Klass was referenced for expert support. It is equally important and a necessity to have an opportunity, to provide witness testimony, because of damages to Appellant, her family members, as secondhand smoke and for the love of humanity, as well as, the American people regarding “known, cover ups.”

Clinton said, the radiation experiments “were shrouded not for a compelling reason of national security but for the simple fear of embarrassment and that was wrong.”

Additionally, Clinton admitted “the work began when many such studies were undertaken in secret to help understand.....” “This was long before it became standard practice to issue “informed consent,” to medical research subjects, laying out the risk and benefits of participation.”

Ibid. Cimons, Marlene, Los Angeles Times. 4 October 1995, Web. 2 June 2020.

I, the Appellant, witnessed U.S. Marine, Phillip M. Bates, who lived upon the 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor with two sons: Phillip and Stephen tell my mother, “Just make sure you get it in writing Lynne, just, make sure you get it in writing.” Several days later, I witnessed her give him a copy. Post, Uncle Phillip’s relocation, U.S. Navy retiree, Gerald Ferguson and family.

North Dallas District Courts should have come to the conclusion the Appellant’s rights had been violated and honored her complaint to be heard in a court of law, after the Appellant; identified within her III. Statement of Claims, she was a victim of o MKULTRA from childhood, that copies of the original contractual documentation was given to some family members, as well as, provided a major witness name, June Merrill Bates, MKULTRA tester, U.S. Army Dr. Fitzgerald’s transporting her to Grand Rapids, MI. to an undercover name, “Siva Mind Control,” for C.I.A. MKULTRA testing and her historical association to the Honorable George H. W. Bush family, III. Statement of Claims, ROA. 19-11208.21-43, confirming public records of The Crowley files, The Black Vault, and The Church Committee, Objection To Judicial Review, 10/21/2019, ROA. 19-11208.964-.971.

The Appellant, Charise L. Logan emphasized within her Objection to Judicial Review, 10/21/2019 ROA. 19-11208.966, 19-11208.968:1, 2, 5, 6 and Notice of Appeal, 11/4/2019, ROA. 19-11208.991:18-20, 19-11208.992:7-14, 16-20, 19-11208.993:1-8, 19-11208.994:1-2, 7-14, 19-11208.996:12-16, 19-11208.1005:6-8, that witness testimony was pertinent to proving childhood and continual “unauthorized testing,” as Pastor Ricky Rush of Inspiring Body of Christ, “who isn’t a defendant within this case” endorsed “conspiracy,” and “collectively agreeing,” “to fraudulently conceal,” the “truth,” by telling the Plaintiff’s coworkers at Walmart, to “treat it like a Big Game,” Objection to Judicial Review 10/21/2019 ROA. 19-11208.967:15-20, 19-11208.968:1-16. IV. Relief, ROA. 19-11208.283, 19-11208.284:1-3 “Examinee has told the truth,” results in Polygraph Exhibits: 2N, 2O, 2P, 2Q. ROA. 19-11208.833-.836, as well as, providing information the Appellant, Plaintiff traveled to 11 different states and several different cities, III. Statement of Claims, ROA. 19-11208.21-.41.

It is my hope, upon the 27 defendants receiving their service in the mail (as I, the Appellant, didn’t have the money to server them at the lower courts) with a copy of the complaint 3:19 cv 01908 electronic docket, THEY WILL BE HUMBLED BY ALMIGHTY GOD TO REPENT AND BRING THE NEGOCIATION FOR THEIR WRONGS TO THE TABLE, before potentially going to trial. I, Charise Logan, appellant DIDN’T REQUEST \$01 CENT OF MONETARY RELIEF from the following defendants, JUST A WRITTEN APOLOGY: The Honorable President Trump, The Honorable President George D. Bush, The Honorable Baraak Obama, The Honorable Michelle Obama, U.S. Army Officer Atlanta, Ga. George, Wendy Logan, Calvin B. Davis, Don Elitz, and Edmond Witherspoon.

It is my expectation, that The U.S. Supreme Court will realize the possibility and allow me, the Appellant to prove in a court of law with witnesses, the alleged reality of the CIA “Interrogation & Waterboarding Room,” for Abu Z, as well as, the private unauthorized

radiation human experiments were just a matter of geographical relocation and experimentation environment set up into the Appellant's whereabouts. As The Book Mobile comes to the neighborhoods to provide books to the children and Blood Bank Mobiles come to a local church or high school, to provide Medical Blood Pressure Testing & Blood Drive Donations; I, the Appellant can prove "Unauthorized Human Experimenting," repetitiously and aggressively hunted me, to different states, places of employment, worship and rest; striving and badgering the Appellant to deny me, Maslow's Five Hierarchy Needs, pursuing the demoralization and defamation of my character and life with a common goal to avoid legal accountability.

With all the hand delivered, faxed and certified documents given to TO SEVERAL FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL AUTHORITIES, it parables with the three officers, who looked upon the murder of George Floyd, and didn't fulfill their responsibility to bring accountability to the defendants, especially, with all the license plates submitted from previous employment at Walmart, 1801 S. Cooper, Arlington, Texas and police escorts with fire truck assistance, they knew, it wasn't "good faith," but a "huge messy, immoral, unethical and embarrassing cover up."

Clearly, the lower courts, by any moral and legal issues presented still erred to honor the Appellants cry, to be heard in a court of law and prove her rights have been violated.

What is "Good Faith," to one, may not be to another, nor the American public.

Clinton stated, "Our government failed in that duty," he apologized "to all the American people who must be able to rely upon the United States to keep its word to tell the truth and to do the right thing."

"Clinton also ordered a review of the procedures for government sponsored research on humans and said he will create a bioethics advisory" panel to police the research process to "see to it that never again do we stray from the basic values of protecting our people and being straight with them.

Ibid. Cimons, Marlene, Los Angeles Times. 4 October 1995, Web. 2 June 2020.

As many years, I, the Appellant, Charise L. Logan have been an "element" of the Central Intelligence Community and associated with The Honorable Bush Family, and all of these people knew it... it compounds the feelings of abandonment, as the 13 left upon the roof in Libya, ultimate disrespect and the absence of a general love of humanity, as a "DP" in the system under "41" with these illegal violations and the U.S. Central Intelligence Community Directive 191: A Duty to Warn. Yet our Air Force One flew to Syria to bomb a wicked dictator gassing innocent children, who weren't born in the U.S.A., nor abandoned children of our military, born in a third world country. Again, the efforts of the Appellant fulfilling the 1955 Clayton Act Section 4B (1), (2), and (3).

Previously mentioned, the Appellant didn't have the finances to serve the 27 defendants to even inform them, that the complaint existed, nor was it required, because they had not been summoned. I, the Appellant, truly believe, the defendants already knew, of the complaint from the alleged "aggressive efforts" to "cover up," these "unauthorized human experimenting," test, which are listed within the Appellant's Statement of Claims. Therefore, with the reality of my complaint challenging honorable, higher authorities within the U.S. government, the Appellant's humble and "first," request for relief, in her appeal conclusion to the Honorable Counsel of The Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals was:

"The Appellant, Plaintiff mercifully and gracefully, petitions for The Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals to inform the Appellee(s), Defendant(s), who weren't summoned at all, of this existing complaint, nor The Appeal 19-11208 on review and mercifully, give them 21 days from this submission 2/10/2020 with the opportunity to review all documents, with "supervised examination," of all exhibits, and be extended the opportunity, to do the right thing, negotiate the petitioned relief, collectively or individually, in the presence of the Honorable Magistrate, however, if, those negotiations don't come to an agreement, then the Defendants be summoned for a trial hearing in the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals."

Question? Will the defendants, especially, the C.I.A- take moral and legal responsibility for these wrongs with "unauthorized human experimentation," with the Appellant, rather their motive was to utilize MKULTRA, as "a tool" to make the Appellant forget my memories, with The Honorable Bush Family or not, or will they attempt to paint the Appellant, "fanciful and delusional" knowing there are living witnesses from my childhood through adult years, who have watched over me, whom also, the Appellant's mother expressed her fears concerning the monitoring government and/or the Honorable Bush family would take her baby, the (Appellant) away from her. I, the Appellant, submitted my witness and experience of those fears, on the record ROA 19-11208.501-19-11208.521

"The lack of a full criminal investigation, the letter warns, "would contribute to the notion that torture remains a permissible policy option for future administrations; undermine the ability of the US to advocate for human rights abroad; and compromise Americans' faith in the rule of law at home."

Pikington, Ed. "Human Rights Groups Call for Special Prosecutor to Investigate CIA Torture." [Https://www.theguardian.com/law/2014/dec/22/aclu-human-rights-watch-ask-eric-holder-prosecute-cia-torture](https://www.theguardian.com/law/2014/dec/22/aclu-human-rights-watch-ask-eric-holder-prosecute-cia-torture). The Guardian, 22 December 2014. Web. 20 May 2020 p. 2

"But secondly, and more importantly, these examples highlight that while we often treat the medical profession as if it is an inherent "good," in the reality it is only as good as the society and organization that builds it. Of course many breaches of medical ethics are due to rogue practitioners acting outside of boundaries, but each of the examples above were allowed to happen because of the values of the society at the time – from governments turning a blind eye to unethical medical experiments, to a society that supports torture and the death penalty.

Our society is built within particular power structures [recall the structures and procedures, that altered justice and accountability, with the voice of the Appellant,

**We see medicine in our society as an inherent good. But as these examples show, it is often only as good as the society that uses it. It is our job as a society therefore to make sure these sorts of breaches do not occur again.”**

Copeland, Simon. “CIA Torture is Only Part of Medical Science’s Dark Modern History.” [Https://www.theguardian.com/science/blog/2015/jun/22/cia-torture-is-only-part-of-medical-sciences-dark-modern-history](https://www.theguardian.com/science/blog/2015/jun/22/cia-torture-is-only-part-of-medical-sciences-dark-modern-history). The Guardian. 22 June 2015. Web. 20 May 2020. p. 5

The Appellant, Charise L. Logan believe it is an additional “arguable basis,” which I have proven, not only do we have individual ideals of what “good faith,” is by our Honorable Commander In Chiefs Bill Clinton and Baraak Obama, Honorable Judge Barbara Lynn and physicians, but also, a variation exists collectively, as a group of women in a class action lawsuit or an ethnic race of people such as, the American Indian having different opinions of what “good faith,” is ... as U.S. wants to violate “restitution settlement land,” awarded in a court of law, with a legal binding judgment, for their reservation settlement land, to never be trespassed again, even with a rerouting of a natural commodity or a gas pipeline.

Nevertheless, no matter, who’s opinion we adapt, endorse or apply, the reality undoubtedly exists, according to education and life experience; what we scientifically refer to as a “domain and range” of what “good faith” is.

These truths endorse, what may not be “good faith,” to one, may indeed be “good faith,” to another.

“Frivolous” was a word, I asked my grandpa about as a child, who had used the word in a conversation with myself, as well as, my grandmother, Unace, while discussing some differences between my aunts and mother. Using a gesture of his hand in a shewing way, my grandpa mentioned, it doesn’t mean nothing baby or amount to anything, irrelevant, it’s not important, that’s all. The dictionary defines “Frivolous,” as an adjective, not having serious purpose or value. A similar word is “Trivial” and an opposite word is “Serious.”

Google Search. Google: <https://www.google.com/search?q=definition+of+frivolous>, 23 August, 2020.

In addition to our United States history of case laws and human rights overcoming this 105 year old “Frivolous,” law, as well as, exposure of our United States governments aggressive attempts to avoid legal accountability with MKULTRA and “unauthorized human experimentation,” this, case law confirms, what may be “Frivolous,” to one, may not be “Frivolous,” to another with this quote:

“[w]hat may seem “trivial” [“Frivolous”] to the uninformed, may appear of great moment to one who has a broad view of the scene and may put the questioned item of information in its proper context.”

**Halkin v. Helms, 194 U.S. App. D.C. 82, 90, 598 F.2d 1, 9 (1978), quoting United States v. Marchetti, 466 F.2d 1309, 1318 (CA4),**” (p.31)

U.S. Supreme Court, CIA v. SIMS, 471 U.S. 159 (1985), 471 U.S. 159 CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY ET AL. v. SIMS ET AL. CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT No. 83-1075. Argued December 4, 1984 Decided April 16, 1985

<Https://archive.is/20121227172157/http://laws.findlaw.com/us/471/159.html#selection-401.1-2475.74> Retrieved: 6 July 2020

I, the Appellant, with all the information for your review submitted with this appeal and previous information provided to the lower courts, whole heartedly disagree with the lower courts decisions, as an element of the CIA Community and a "DP," marked in the system by the late Honorable 41<sup>st</sup> President George H. W. Bush. I, the Appellant, furthermore, disagree with the numerous federal jurisdictional law violations surrounding my complaint and the Honorable Judge Barbara Lynn's order stating, she doesn't believe the Appellant, appealed the lower courts judgment, "in good faith." Bishop T.D. Jakes taught me, The Appellant "Tangible Faith."

It is a good reason morally, as The Honorable Bill Clinton previously referenced apology for the unauthorized human experimentation with radiation, to grant The Appellant's petition by applying "Tangible Faith" and legally grant the petition, by applying *Id.* At *32 Coppedge v United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 447 (1962), "when initially assessing a complaint, the factual allegations must be weighed in favor of the Plaintiff."

Granting the reversal of the lower courts "Frivolous," judgment will allow the Appellant to prove the validity of my complaint in a court of law with documentation and witnesses, for I have provided an arguable basis in fact with "unauthorized human experimentation," and "conspiracy, with collectively agreeing to fraudulently conceal a matter and defraud the public," with the applicable federal jurisdictional governing laws. Additionally, I provided a portion of over 600 (543?) exhibits within the Appendixes proving my efforts on federal, state and local levels of authorities to find out "cause of action." Please review: Polygraph: 19-11208.833-.836, Appendix K and Michelle Obama's Powerful New Hampshire Speech pg. 1-4 Appendix J.

"We granted certiorari, 465 U.S. 1078 (1984) and 467 U.S. 1240 (1984). We now reverse in part and affirm in part." (p.32)

U.S. Supreme Court, *CIA v. SIMS*, 471 U.S. 159 (1985), 471 U.S. 159 CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY ET AL. v. SIMS ET AL. CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 83-1075. Argued December 4, 1984 Decided April 16, 1985

<Https://archive.is/20121227172157/http://laws.findlaw.com/us/471/159.html#selection-401.1-2475.74> Retrieved: 6 July 2020

Prayerfully, "reverse in whole," summon the defendants, who are well able to apologize, as the humble Honorable Bill Clinton "without itemization," of illegal wrongs and the other government and corporate defendants negotiate their monetary restitution for allegedly allowing the "unauthorized human experimentation" as well as, without warning the Appellant and thus, allow the Appellant to "affirm the truth," of my complaint in a court of law with witnesses "in whole."

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

State of Texas, County of Tarrant

This documentation was acknowledged before me on

8/28/26 (date) \_\_\_\_\_ (name of person)

Seal Signature of Notary Public

