

SEP 14 2020

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. 20-6392

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PETER GAKUBA

— PETITIONER

(Your Name)

vs.

USA

— RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

U.S. COURT APPEALS - D.C.

(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

PETER GAKUBA (M52946)

(Your Name)

VIENNA DC

6695 STATE RT., 146 E.

(Address)

VIENNA, IL 62995

(City, State, Zip Code)

N/A

(Phone Number)

ORIGINAL

GAKUBA
PET.

#

✓ O'BRIEN, ET AL.
RESP.

U.S. SUPREME COURT

ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

(A) ① THE VIDEO PRIVACY PROTECTION ACT (VPPA) 18 USC §§ 2710(a), 2710(b)(2)(c), 2710(d), 2710(e)

AMAZON v. LAZ 758 F.Supp.2d 1154 (E.D. WA 2010); CARPENTER v. US 138 S.Ct. 2206 FWHY (4/22/18)

CANFIELD v. CITY OF OKC 248 F.3d 1214, 1233 (10th 2001); STERK v. REOBOK 672 F.3d 535, 538 (7th 2012)

② THE DRIVER PRIVACY PROTECTION ACT (DPPA) 18 USC § 2721 ET SEQ.

DAHLSTROM v. SUNTIMES 777 F.3d 937 (7th 2015); MCVEIGH v. COHEN 983 F.Supp.2d 215 (D. OR. 1998)

SEMME v. PALATINE 695 F.3d 597 (7th 2012, EN BANC)

AS A MATTER OF LAW, GAKUBA IS ENTITLED TO EQUITABLE RELIEF PER 18 USC § 2710(c) + § (d) CONSISTENT W/

AMAZON v. LAZ + CARPENTER v. US = TRO, PRELIM. + PERM. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF, DECLARATORY JUDGMENT;

LIKEWISE THE SAME EQUITABLE RELIEF IS DOUBLY AFFORDED PER 18 USC § 2721 ET SEQ. CONSISTENT W/

DAHLSTROM v. SUNTIMES + SEMME v. PALATINE. THE USOR, NO. II, W.D.N. AND USCA7 WERE FLATLY WRONG

TO ASSERT HECK v. HUMPHREY AS BARRING RELIEF, MUCH LESS THAT GAKUBA'S EQUITABLE RELIEF IS A MIS-

CAPTIONED "MOTION IN LIMINE. ARBITRARY, FANCIFUL, OBJECTIVELY UNREASONABLE.

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:

GAKUBA

PET.

v. USA.

RESP.

#

U.S. SUPREME COURT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW

JURISDICTION

CONSTITUTIONAL / STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

CONCLUSION

INDEX - APPENDICES : EQUITABLE RELIEF

APPENDIX A

US DISTRICT JUDGE'S FINAL ORDER/JUDGMENT

A1 - A3

11/12/19

APPENDIX B

US COURT APPEALS-DC. FINAL ORDER/JUDGMENT

A4 - A5

6/3/20

APPENDIX C

US COURT APPEALS-DC PET. REHEARING,

HEARING EN BANC DENIED

7/27/20

A6 - A7

BAKUBA
PET.

11

v. O'BRIEN, ET AL
RESPS.

U.S. SUPREME COURT

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<u>CASES</u>	<u>PAGE #</u>
AMAZON v. IAY 758 F.SUPP.2d 1154 (E.D.WA 2010)	4, 6-7, 10, 12
BELAMY v. CITY NYC 914 F.3d 727 (2 ND 2019)	12
BORMES v. USA 759 F.3d 793 (7 TH 2014)	9
BROWN v. ILLINOIS 422 US 590 (1975)	5, 8
CAMFIELD v. CITY OKC 248 F.3d 1214, 1233 (10 TH 2001)	6
CARPENTER v. US 138 S.C.T. 2206 FH#4 (6/22/18)	6, 8
DAHLSTROM v. SUNTIMES 777 F.3d 937, 940 (7 TH 2015)	7, 9, 12
DAHLSTROM v. SUNTIMES 39 F.SUPP.3d 998, 1001 (NO.11 2014)	9
DOE v. HARRIS 772 F.3d 563, 583 (9 TH 2014)	10
FRANKS v. DELAWARE 438 US 154 (1978)	4-6, 8, 11
FREEDMAN v. AMERICA ONLINE 325 F.SUPP.2d 638 (D.CT. 2004)	7
BAKUBA v. BROWN 19cv5429 (NO.11.)	12
BAKUBA v. FARDON 14cv50125 (NO.11.) 14-02335 (7 TH)	12
BAKUBA v. KARNER 13cv50218 (NO.11.)	12
BAKUBA v. NEESE 17cv50337 (NO.11.) 18-3398, 19-2669 (7 TH)	6, 11
BAKUBA v. KURTZ 523 FED. APPX. 402 (7 TH 2013)	6
BAKUBA v. O'BRIEN 12cv7294 (NO.11.) 711 F.3d 751 (7 TH 2013)	6-7, 11
HECK v. HUMPHREY, FH#7	11
JOHNSON v. WINSTEAD 900 F.3d 428, 436 (7 TH 2018)	11
LEWERT v. PF CHENG 2016 WL 1459226 *5	7
MILKE v. RYAN 711 F.3d 998 (9 TH 2013)	12
NADUE v. ILLINOIS 360 US 269 (1965)	6, 8, 11
MEVEIGH v. COHEN 983 F.SUPP.2d 215 (D.DC.1998)	7-8
PEOPLE v. BAKUBA 2017 IL APP (2d) 150744-U, 2019 IL APP (2d) 170794-U	5
RODRIGUEZ v. BOMM 801 F.3d 1045, 1055 (9 TH 2015)	7, 9
SENNE v. VILLAGE OF PALATINE III 295 F.3d 597 (7 TH 2012) (ENBANC)	10, 12

(CONT'D)

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

PAGE #

STERK II v. REDBOX 672 F.3d 535, 538 (7TH 2012)

7, 12

TUCKER v. WADDELL 83 F.3d 688 (4TH 1996)

8

WALLACE v. KATO 549 US 384, 387-88 (2007)

11

DRIVER PRIVACY PROTECTION ACT

18 USC § 2721 ET SEQ.

ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PRIVACY ACT 18 USC § 2701 ET SEQ.

VIDEO PRIVACY PROTECTION ACT

18 USC § 2710 ET SEQ.

FOREIGN INTEL. SURVEILLANCE ACT

50 USC § 1806e

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 B, C to the petition and is

☐ reported at _____; or,

☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,

☒ is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix A to the petition and is

☐ reported at _____; or,

☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,

☒ is unpublished.

☐ For cases from **state courts**:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

☐ reported at _____; or,

☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,

☐ is unpublished.

The opinion of the _____ court appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

☐ reported at _____; or,

☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,

☐ is unpublished.

JURISDICTION

☒ For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was 6/3/20

☐ 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: 7/27/20, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix C.

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

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1254(1).

☐ For cases from **state courts**:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was _____.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix _____.

☐ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: _____, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____.

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

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).

CONSTITUTIONAL / STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

①

7th 4th 14th AMENDS VIOLATIONS FOR VIOLATING THE VIDEO PRIVACY PROTECTION ACT (VPPA)

②

18 USC § 2710(a), 2710(b)(2)(C), 2710(d), 2710(e)

③

THE DRIVER PRIVACY PROTECTION ACT (DPPA)

18 USC § 2721 et seq.

①

CAMPFELD v. CITY OF C 248 F.3d 1214 (10th 2001); AMATON v. IAN 758 F.802.2d 1154 (E.D. WA 2010)

CARRUTHER v. US 138 A.C.T. 2206 F.M.4 (6/12/2018)

US v. WILSON 630 F.3d 1075 (11th 2013) (2013 US v. DOMOVAN 429 US 413, 432 n. 22 (1977))

JOHNSON v. WINSTON 900 F.3d 428, 436-37 (7th 2018) (cites HECK F.M. 7 + WALKER v. KATO 549 US 384 387-88)

②

DAHLSTROM v. SOUTHWEST 777 F.3d 937 (7th 2015); SENNE v. PALATINE 695 F.3d 597 (7th 2012, EWING)

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

I

INTRODUCTION / BACKGROUND

THIS IS A CASE OF 1ST IMPRESSION INVOLVING THE IDENTITY THEFT OF GAKUBA BY LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES THROUGH THE DELIBERATE AND EXPLOITATIVE VIOLATION OF THE VPPA (PRIMARY) THEN OPPIA (SECONDARILY) WHEN THEY COMPELLED THE ILLEGAL DISCLOSURE OF GAKUBA'S HOLLYWOOD VIDEOS CUSTOMER ACCOUNT RECORDS W/O THE REQUIRED LEGAL PROCESS, 18 USC § 2710(b)(2)(C). WHEN LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES COMPEL THE ILLEGAL DISCLOSURE OF "PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFO" (PII) (18 USC § 2710(2)) TO THEMSELVES, SIMULTANEOUSLY THEY VIOLATE THE VPPA'S STATUTORY BARRING RECEIPT AS EVIDENCE "PII" IN OR BEFORE A "GRAND JURY, DEPT, OFFICER, AGENCY, [] OR OTHER AUTHORITY OF THE USA [+/OR] A STATE []" (18 USC § 2710(4)). HERE, THEY FURTHER ORDERED HOLLYWOOD VIDEOS NOT TO NOTICE GAKUBA AND, WORSE STILL, RESORTED TO DECEIT AS FRANKS VIOLATIONS THAT ONLY WAS EXPOSED / DISCOVERED YEARS AFTER THE WRONGDOING FIRST OCCURRED. NOW, W/O ANY LEGITIMATE BASES TO RETAIN GAKUBA'S "PII" THEY INSIST ON DOING SO; REFUSING TO DESTROY ALL RECORDS ILLEGALLY OBTAINED FULLY 15 YEARS LATER, IN VIOL. OF 18 USC § 2710(c). CONSEQUENTLY, RESTING ON PLAIN UNDISPUTED FACTS, THE LAW MANDATES EQUITABLE RELIEF AS THE ONLY EFFECTIVE REMEDY. SEE AMAZON v. LAZ 758 F. SUPP. 2d 1154 (E.D. WA 2010); 5TH AMEND, LATIF v. HOLDER 3:10-cv-750-BR (D. OR.).

ON NOV. 4, 2006 IL STATE POLICE (ISP) WERE CALLED TO INVESTIGATE A MISSING PERSON'S REPORT OF A THEN 14 Y.O. GAY TEEN, MATTHEW S. (M.S.). M.S. COMPLAINED OF PERSECUTION BY DEVOUT CATHOLIC HOMOPHOBIC PARENTS WHO, IN RESPONSE, COMPLAINED ABOUT M.S.'S CHILD PORN TRAFFICKING (INCL. TEXTING "SELFIES") TO DEFLECT THEIR OUTRAGE. INSTEAD M.S. CLAIMED HE WAS KIDNAPPED AND RAPE BY AN 18 Y.O. WHITE MALE NAMED "PHIL." (GAKUBA: A THEN 36 Y.O. BLACK MALE)

NOT BELIEVING M.S.'S INCREIBLE STORY, THEY INSTEAD PURSUED "STATUTORY RAPE" CHARGES AS M.S. CLAIMED TO HAVE SPENT THE NIGHT AT A ROCKFORD, IL. HOTEL WHEREBY PHIL HAD RENTED "SCARY MOVIES 1, 2, 3" FOR M.S. TO WATCH WHILE PHIL SLEPT. FINDING NO "PHIL" IN THE GUEST REGISTRY AT THE ROCKFORD, IL. MARRIOTT, ISP LED BY CHARLES O'BRIEN SUPERVISED BY ASST. SA KATE KURTZ, WENT TO A NEARBY HOLLYWOOD VIDEOS STORE REQUESTING "WHO ... RENTED THEM MOVIES." 18 USC § 2710(b)(2)(C). IN RESPONSE, ISP + O'BRIEN WERE GIVEN GAKUBA'S HOLLYWOOD VIDEOS CUSTOMER ACCT. INFO. INCLUDING GAKUBA'S BIRTHDATE WHICH O'BRIEN CAREFULLY MEMORIALIZED IN HANDWRITTEN POLICE NOTES LEAST HE FORGET. (NOTE:

THE ELEMENTS OF STATUTORY RAPE ARE MERELY THE PARTIES' AGES AND SEXUAL ACTIVITY. 725 ILS 5/12-16(1)

RETURNING TO THE MARRIOTT THEY ASKED THE FRONT DESK CLERK "DO YOU HAVE SOMEONE HERE BY THAT NAME. GEE WE SURE DO." ASA KURTZ EXCITEDLY UTTERED IN ARGUING THAT THIS EVIDENTIARY FUND WAS THE PRIVITY ESTABLISHING "100% PROBABLE CAUSE." UPON RECEIPT OF MORE "P11" - ROOM 101 (THE 1ST ROOM BEHIND THE FRONT DESK) -- O'BRIEN ET AL COMMITTED AN ILLEGAL 4TH AMEND. / BROWN V. IL. HOME INVASION. THE FIRST SEARCHED + SEIZED ITEMS WERE BAKUBA AND HIS WALLET -- SPECIFICALLY BIRTHDATE CONTAINED IN HIS DRIVER'S LIC. -- CORROBORATING HE WAS "WHO ... RENTED THEM MOVIES."

DECEMBER 2008 - JANUARY 2009 THE 1ST OF TWO SUPPRESSION HEARINGS WAS HELD. THIS ONE ON 5TH / 6TH AMENDS. VIOL. THAT QUESTIONING SHOULD HAVE CEASED UPON BAKUBA ASSERTING HIS RIGHT TO SPEAK W/ HIS PERSONAL LAWYER - DAVID SHAPIRO OF BALTIMORE, MD. O'BRIEN WAS THE KEY STATE WITNESS, FALSELY TESTIFYING BAKUBA WAS NOT UNDER ARREST, BUT, A "MATERIAL WITNESS". MOTION DENIED.

JUNE 2011 THE 2ND SUPPRESSION HEARING OCCURRED AS BAKUBA RETAINED NEW COUNSEL NOT FROM ROCKFORD, IL -- DEBRA SCHAFER, BUT FROM CHICAGO, IL -- THEN 29 Y.O. BEAU BRINDLEY. ITS CONCLUSION RESULTED IN THE IL. STATE TRIAL JUDGE JOHN TRUITT QUASHING ALL 3 WARRANTS EVER ISSUED: HOTEL, RENTAL CAR SEARCH WARRANTS, AND BUCCAL WARRANT FOR BAKUBA'S DNA. THE REASONING: A BROWN V. IL. 4TH AMEND. VIOL. OCCURRED MANDATING SUPPRESSION OF ALL PURPORTED CUSTODIAL INTERROGATION STATEMENTS, AND, THERE WERE FALSE AFFIDAVITS MADE W/ "RECKLESS DISREGARD FOR THE TRUTH" AND, ONCE THE FALSETIES WERE EXPOSED, THERE LAY BARE NO PROBABLE CAUSE AS THERE NO LONGER WAS AN IDENTIFIABLE SUSPECT OR PLACE TO BE SEARCHED. FRANKS V. DE.

AT THAT TIME, BAKUBA HAD FILED A VPPA SUPPRESSION MOTION IN JUNE 2011, BUT IT ONLY WAS GRANTED AT BAKUBA'S URGING WHILE PROSE IN OCTOBER 2013. DESPITE GRANTING THE MOTION, THE IL. TRIAL JUDGE RECKLESSLY DISREGARDED HIS VERY OWN RULING BY CALLING THE VPPA "BIZARRE."

IN PEOPLE V. BAKUBA 2017 IL APP (2d) 150744-U (DIRECT APPEAL) AND PEOPLE V. BAKUBA 2019 IL APP (2d) 170744-U (POST-CONVICTION) THE IL. APP. CT. RECKLESSLY DISREGARDED BAKUBA'S INSISTENCE THAT THEY OBEY + ENFORCE VPPA'S 18 USC § 2710 (b) EXCLUSIONARY MANDATE IN A 58 PAGE + 26 PAGE OPINIONS AFFIRMING BAKUBA'S WRONGFUL CONVICTIONS AND SENTENCE. INSTEAD, THEY FANatically CONCLUDE THAT BAKUBA'S BIRTHDATE WAS "INDEPENDENTLY SOURCED" SUBSEQUENT TO ITS ILLEGAL OBTAINMENT BY O'BRIEN

FROM A FALSE/FABRICATED "BOOKING PROCESS - VERSION" AND CARUBA'S FABRICATED HEARSAY RESPONSE
FALSELY ATTRIBUTED TO CARUBA.

IN JUNE 2011 CARUBA WHILE PRO SE ANNOUNCED AND HAND-TEMPERED IN OPEN COURT TO THE PROSECUTORS
AND TALAL JUDGE CARUBA'S "BOOKING PROCESS" DENIAL AFFIDAVIT. IT HAS BEEN IGNORED BY EVERYONE.

AS A MATTER OF FACT, AND W/ NO RECORD AT ALL, CARUBA'S AFFIDAVIT IS SUBSTANTIVE, DISPOSITIVE
EVIDENCE IN CARUBA'S FAVOR TURNING ADJUDGED FRANKS PERJURER ISP O'BRIEN INTO A NARVE PERJURER
FOR HAVING FALSELY TESTIFIED AT CARUBA'S 2 1/2 DAY JURY TRIAL IN APRIL 2015 TO THIS FALSE |
FABRICATED "BOOKING PROCESS" Q + A.

CARUBA'S FEOL DISTRICT AND CIRCUIT COURT PRO SE LEGAL EFFORTS AT ENFORCING HIS VPPA RIGHTS
HAVE TOO BEEN IN VAIN.

IN CARUBA v. NEESE 17CV50337 (MD.L), 12-3398 (7TH) HABEAS RELIEF WAS DENIED, 28 USC
§§ 2253, 2254. ACKNOWLEDGING CARUBA'S "BOOKING PROCESS" DENIAL AFFIDAVIT, THE US DISTRICT COURT
FAMIFULLY CONCLUDED IT TO BE "IRRELEVANT" YET CITED NO AUTHORITY - RECORD OR LAW. IRRATIONAL.

IN CARUBA v. KURTZ 523 FED. APPX. 402 (7TH 2015) THE USCA-7 CITES TO THE WRONG CASE LAW THAT
DEALT NOT W/ LEGAL PROCESS -- 18 USC § 2710 (b)(2)(C) -- BUT W/ ANOTHER MEANS OF OBTAINMENT:
18 USC § 2710 (b)(2)(E). CARUBA AT 403, CITES DANIEL v. CANTRELL 375 F.3d 372, 382 (6TH 2004).

INDEED, DANIEL FM#4 SPECIFICALLY DISTINGUISHES ITSELF FROM CARUBA'S ON-POINT CASE LAW:
CAMFIELD v. CITY OF OKC 248 F.3d 1214, 1233 (10TH 2001)

NOW CARUBA RENEWS HIS STATUTORY RIGHTS ENFORCEMENT IN CARUBA v. O'BRIEN 12CV7296 (MD.L.)
BY CITING CAMFIELD, AMAZON v. LAY 758 F.SUPP.2d 1154 (ED.WA 2010), CARPENTER v. US 138 S.Ct. 2206
FM#4 (12/18). (ECF 350, 323, 312, 311).

HOWEVER, IN A SPECIOUS AND CONCLUSORY 2-PAGE RULING OF 3/20/2019, NOT ONLY DOES US DISTRICT
JUDGE KAPALA AFFIRM THE MAGISTRATE'S R+R, INCREDIBLY, HE GOES ON TO ARGUE CARUBA'S EQUITABLE RELIEF
MOTION IS A MISCAPTIONED "MOTION IN LIMINE". IF TRUE, THERE SHOULD BE AMPLE CASE LAW PRECEDENCE OF
SUCH PRIOR OCCURRENCES - NONE ARE CITED BECAUSE NONE EXIST.

WHEN CARUBA SOUGHT APPELLATE REVIEW FROM THE USCA-7 IFP, US DISTRICT JUDGE DUKKIN CERTIFIES
CARUBA'S APPEAL IS IN BAD FAITH IN A 2-PAGE WHOLLY CONCLUSORY, ROTE, FORMULATIC LEGAL CONCLUSION.

AUGUST 5, 2019 US CIRCUIT JUDGE BRENNAN SUSPICIOUSLY DENIES BOTH BAKUBA'S HABEAS APPEAL AND THIS ONE, DESPITE THE FACT APPEALS WERE TAKEN AT DIFFERENT TIMES / MONTHS; UNDERMINING THE PUBLIC'S CONFIDENCE IN THE JUDICIARY'S FAIRNESS AND INTEGRITY AS BOTH CASES ALSO WERE ASSIGNED, THEN DENIED, BY THE SAME DISTRICT JUDGE: KAPALA (OVER BAKUBA'S NOCIFEROUS OBJECTIONS THAT A DIFFERENT DIST. JUDGE DECIDE BAKUBA'S HABEAS; SEPARATE FROM THIS CIVIL SUIT). BAKUBA v. O'BRIEN 19-1640 (7TH)

II

DISCUSSION / ARGUMENT

AMAZON v. IAY 758 F. SUPP. 2d 1154 (E.D. WA 2016) IS ON-POINT AND DETERMINATIVE - YET NEITHER THE US DISTRICT NOR CIRCUIT COURTS ACKNOWLEDGE SO, INSTEAD, DELIBERATELY IGNORANT OF IT. CF. McVEIGH v. COHEN 983 F. SUPP. 2d 215 (D.D.C. 1998), DAHLSTROM v. SONTIMES 777 F.3d 937 (7TH 2015).

BAKUBA'S PRIVACY INTERESTS ARE GOVERNED BY STATUTE OVERLAPED BY THE 1ST AMENDMENT. AMAZON AT 1160-1163; US CONST. ART. 3, § 2, CL 1. SEE LEWERT v. PF REHME 2016 WL 1459226 *5 (CITING STARK II v. REDBOX 770 F.3d 618, 623 (7TH 2014) LEGAL INTEREST IN "PII" IN VIDEO RENTAL CONTEXT COMPARABLE TO PROPERTY RIGHT). CF. RODRIGUEZ v. SONY 801 F.3d 1045, 1053 (9TH 2015) (EQUITABLE RELIEF DISCUSSED: ILLEGAL DISCLOSURE (OBTAINMENT) VERSUS ILLEGAL RETENTION.)).

BAKUBA CITED TO COMPARABLE FED'L PRIVACY LAW AND CASE AUTHORITY. (18 USC § 2710 IS COMPARABLE TO 42 USC § 4332 + 16 USC § 1456)

FOR EXAMPLE, THE ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION PRIVACY ACT (ECPA) 18 USC § 2701 ET SEQ.; FREEDMAN v. AMERICA ONLINE 325 F.3d SUPP. 2d 638 (D.D.C.) (2004) (CITES McVEIGH v. COHEN 983 F. SUPP. 2d 215 (D.D.C. 1998)): McVEIGH AT 219.

IN McVEIGH, A NAVY OFFICER CONTACTED AOL AND REQUESTED INFO. ABOUT THE IDENTITY OF AN AOL CUSTOMER (THAT BEING McVEIGH, ALSO A NAVY OFFICER). McVEIGH AT 217. AOL DISCLOSED THE INFO., AND CONSEQUENTLY THE NAVY ADVISED McVEIGH IT WAS COMMENCING AN ADMINISTRATIVE DISCHARGE PROCEEDING AGAINST HIM ON THE BASIS THAT HE WAS INVOLVED IN HOMOSEXUAL CONDUCT VIOLATING THE 'DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL' POLICY. ID. McVEIGH SOUGHT A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION, ARGUING THAT THE NAVY OFFICER(S) VIOLATED HIS RIGHTS UNDER THE ECPA. ID. AT 216.

MCVEIGH ALSO ALLEGED THAT HIS RIGHTS WERE ALSO VIOLATED UNDER THE NAU's OWN POLICY, AS WELL AS THE 4TH + 5TH AMENDS. IBID. IN CONSIDERING THE SUBSTANTIAL LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS ON THE MERITS, THE COURT NOTED THAT THE NAU's ACTIONS WERE 'LIKELY ILLEGAL UNDER THE ... ECPA.' 10 AT 219. THE COURT STATED THAT 'IN SOLICITING AND OBTAINING ... PERSONAL INFO. ABOUT MCVEIGH FROM AOL' THE GOV'T FAILED TO COMPLY W/ THE ECPA's REQUIREMENTS THAT IT EITHER (1) HAD A VALID WARRANT OR (2) GAVE THE PLAINTIFF PRIOR NOTICE AND SOUGHT A SUBPOENA OR COURT ORDER. 10 AT 219.

HERE, EVERY STATE AND FED'L COURT TO DATE PROMOTE A FALSE/FABRICATED "BOOKING PROCESS-VERSION" Q + A AS AN "INDEPENDENT SOURCE" FOR GARUBA'S ILLEGAL BIRTHDATE OBTAINMENT -- FABRICATED HEARSAY FALSELY ATTRIBUTED TO GARUBA. IT IS Akin TO THE 2-STEP INTERROGATION ARGUMENT WIDELY DEBUNKED AS JUNK LAW. BOOKING PROCESS EXCEPTIONS APPLY ONLY TO 5TH AMEND PROTECTIONS. NEVER HAS IT BEEN USED AS AN EXCEPTION TO A STATUTE'S EXCLUSION MANDATE; MUCH LESS THE 4TH AMEND. EXCLUSIONARY RULE THAT MERELY FORTIFIES BUT NEVER REPLACES THE STATUTE'S. SEE US v. DORCHMAN 429 US 413, 432 n.22 (1977); BROWN v. IL; HAYES v. FL; DAVIS v. MS.

AS A MATTER OF LAW IT FAILS, AND, FACT TOO: GARUBA'S "BOOKING PROCESS" DENIAL AFFIDAVIT IS SUBSTANTIVE, DISPOSITIVE EVIDENCE AS NO RECORD EXISTS -- NONE, NOWHERE -- OF THIS NARVE PERJURY BY ADJUDGED FRANKS PERJURER = ISP O'BRIEN.

THE MCVEIGH COURT REJECTED THE GOV'T'S ARGUMENT THAT PURSUANT TO TUCKER v. WADDELL 83 F.3d 628 (4TH 1996) THERE IS NO CAUSE OF ACTION UNDER § 2703(c). 10 AT 220. IN TUCKER, THE COURT ANALYZED THE STATUTORY LANGUAGE AND FOUND THAT ALTHOUGH THE GOV'T MAY BE LIABLE FOR VIOL. OF §§ 2703(a) OR (b), "THE LANGUAGE OF § 2703(a) DOES NOT PROHIBIT ANY GOV'T CONDUCT, AND THUS A GOV'T ENTITY MAY NOT VIOLATE THAT SUBSECTION BY SIMPLY ACCESSING INFO. IMPROPERLY." TUCKER AT 693. HOWEVER, TUCKER ACKNOWLEDGED THE POSSIBILITY THAT A GOV'T ENTITY MIGHT VIOLATE § 2703(c) BY AIDING-AND-ABETTING OR CONSPIRING IN THE PROVIDER'S VIOLATION. 10 AT 693 n.6. MCVEIGH REJECTED TUCKER BECAUSE THE SECTIONS OF § 2703 "WERE INTENDED TO WORK IN TANDEM TO PROTECT CONSUMER PRIVACY." MCVEIGH AT 220. (EMPHASIS)

HERE, THE UNDISPUTED RECORD PLAINLY SHOWS ISP (ALONG W/ EVERY OTHER FEDL + IL LAW ENFORCE-
MENT ENTITY UNDER THE "COLLECTIVE KNOWLEDGE" / "FELLOW OFFICER" DOCTRINES) NOT ONLY WERE
AIDERS, ABETTORS, CO-CONSPIRATORS TO HOLLYWOOD VIDEO'S 18 USC § 2710 (b)(2)(C) VIOL. OF LAW, EVERY
COURT, OFFICER ... OTHER AUTHORITY ... IN OR BEFORE ... OTHER PROCEEDINGS ... OF THE USA ... +/OR A
STATE, ARE LIABLE TOO -- INCLUDING JUDGES. ACCORD CARPENTER V. US 138 S. CT. 2206 FM#4 (6/22/12)
(PROVIDERS WHO VIOLATE § 2710 (b) ARE LIABLE TO THE AGGRIEVED PER § 2710 (d)); SEE ALSO
BORMES V. USA 133 S. CT. 12 (2012), BORMES V. USA 759 F.3d 793 (7th 2014) (AT 795: PLAIN LANGUAGE
OF STATUTE BREACHES "SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY").

AS A MATTER OF LAW GARUBA IS ENTITLED TO EQUITABLE RELIEF: TRD, PREM. + PERM. INJUNCTION,
DECLARATORY JUDGMENT PER THE VPPA, AND THE UNDISPUTED DPPA VIOLATION THEREAFTER.

ON POINT: RODRIGUEZ V. SOMY 801 F.3d 1045, FM#1 (9th 2015) CITES STERK V. REDBOX 672 F.3d 535, 537
(7th 2012) ("OBSERVING THAT 'THE STATUTE SAYS [18 USC § 2710] (d), BUT THIS MUST BE AN ERROR, NOT
ONLY BECAUSE THE ONLY 'RELIEF' PROVIDED THERE IS EXCLUSION OF THE PII FROM EVIDENCE, BUT ALSO
BECAUSE IT IS VERY UNLIKELY THAT A VIDEO PROVIDER WOULD EVER BE SUBMITTING AS EVIDENCE IN A LEGAL
PROCEEDING PII THAT THE PROVIDER HAD DISCLOSED.'") (EMPHASIS)

GARUBA'S COMPLAINTS PLAINLY PLED THAT HE SEEKS EQUITABLE RELIEF AGAINST THE ILLEGAL DISCLOSURERS:
HOLLYWOOD VIDEO AND ALL AIDERS, ABETTORS, CO-CONSPIRATORS -- STATE + FEDL AGENTS / AGENCIES WHO
NOT ONLY COMPELLED GARUBA'S PII ILLEGAL DISCLOSURE, THEN RECEIPT TO THEMSELVES, BUT ARE DOING
SO BEFORE EVERY AUTHORITY ... EVERY PROCEEDING ... OF THE USA +/OR A STATE "IN PERPETUITY."
18 USC § 2710 (d), § (e). WORSE, THE UNDISPUTED PLAIN RECORD SHOWS THEY CONCEALED THEIR
LAWLESSNESS THEREAFTER AS FRANKS V. DE FLAGRANT VIOL. OF LAW TO SUSTAIN, NOW, A MALICIOUS
PROSECUTION AND WRONGFUL CONVICTION, FALSE IMPRISONMENT.

ON POINT: DAHLSTROM V. SUNITMES 777 F.3d 937, 940 (7th 2015) HAD AFFIRMANCE OF THE DISTRICT
COURT'S RULING THAT PUBLISHING PII (DISCLOSURE) IN VIOL. OF THE DPPA / 18 USC § 2721 IS PROHIBITED
BY MEDIA. INDEED, DAHLSTROM SOUGHT EQUITABLE RELIEF: INJUNE. + DECLARATORY. DAHLSTROM 39 F. SUPP. 2d
998, 1001 (W.D. 2014). THIS, IN SPITE OF PII HAVING ALREADY BEEN PUBLISHED / DISCLOSED ILLEGALLY, THE COURTS
9/13

NONETHELESS WERE SYMPATHETIC TOWARDS ENJOINING FUTURE PERPETUAL ILLEGAL DISCLOSURES / PUBLICATIONS. FURTHER, IT CITES TO PRECEDING PRECEDENCE: SENNE V. VILLAGE OF PALATINE III 695 F.3d 597 (7TH 2012, EN BANC) THAT ALSO RESULTED IN DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF. DISSENTER (POSNER, J.) NOTES THAT BOTH THE VPPA + DPPA CONTAIN "IDENTICAL LANGUAGE." (p.32, IP1).

ON POINT: AMAZON v. LAI 758 F.Supp.2d 1154, 1167-69 (ED.WA.2010) GRANTED THE VERY EQUITABLE RELIEF GARUBA HAS SOUGHT PER THE VPPA WHICH VIOLATES THE 1ST AMENDMENT IN TANDEM.

AMAZON AND THE INTERVENORS HAVE ESTABLISHED THAT THE 1ST AMEND. PROTECTS THE DISCLOSURE OF INDIVIDUAL'S READING, LISTENING, AND VIEWING HABITS [.] THE [NC ATTY GEN'L'S] DOR CONCEDES THAT THE 1ST AMEND. PROTECTS THEM FROM SUCH DISCLOSURES. ID AT 1168. (EMPHASIS)

CF DOE v. HARRIS 772 F.3d 563, 583. (9TH 2014) ("THE LOSS OF 1ST AMEND. FREEDOMS, FOR EVEN MINIMAL PERIODS OF TIME, UNQUESTIONABLY CONSTITUTES IRREPARABLE INJURY [CITATION OMITTED]. A COLORABLE 1ST AMEND. CLAIM IS IRREPARABLE INJURY [.]").

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

ON POINT: JOHNSON V. WINSTEAD 900 F.3d 428, 436 (7th 2018) (HECK NOT APPLICABLE PER FM#7)

("READ AS A WHOLE THE POINT OF FM#7 COMES INTO SHARPER FOCUS. CONSTITUTIONAL WRONGS THAT OCCUR AND ARE COMPLETE OUTSIDE A CRIMINAL PROCEEDING (FOR EXAMPLE, UNREASONABLE SEARCHES) ... ARE INDEPENDENTLY ACTIONABLE REGARDLESS OF THEIR IMPACT ON A CONVICTION, WHICH TAKES THEM OUTSIDE THE HECK RULE -- BUT W/ THE IMPORTANT QUALIFIER THAT THE SCOPE OF THE RECOVERY CANNOT INCLUDE CONVICTION-RELATED INJURIES. (EMPHASIS) ; WALLACE V. KATO 549 US 384, 387-88 (2007) CONCERNED THE ACCRUAL RULE FOR A §1983 CLAIM ALLEGING A 4TH AMEND. VIOLATION FOR UNLAWFUL ARREST. 549 US AT 387.")

JOHNSON AT 437: "A CAUSE OF ACTION FOR VIOLATION OF THE RIGHT TO BE FREE FROM UNREASONABLE SEIZURE IS COMPLETE AND PRESENT BEFORE ANY CONVICTION ENSUES -- INDEED, IT IS AN ACTIONABLE CONSTITUTIONAL WRONG INDEPENDENT OF ANY CONVICTION THAT MIGHT LATER BE OBTAINED (WITH OR WITHOUT THE FRUITS OF THE UNLAWFUL ARREST). ID. AT 393-94. WALLACE THUS CLARIFIED THAT HECK DELAYS THE ACCRUAL OF A §1983 CLAIM 'UNTIL THE SETTING ASIDE OF AN EXISTANT CONVICTION WHICH SUGGESTS IN THAT TORT ACTION WOULD IMPEACH.' ID." (EMPHASIS)

OVER AND OVER GARUBA CITED TO THIS ON-POINT CONTROLLING CASE LAW: BOTH IN GARUBA'S "REPLY" TO THE MAGISTRATE'S R+R, AND MOTIONS TO PROCEED ON APPEAL IEP. (DISTRICT + CIRCUIT COURTS). NEITHER (NOW RETIRED) JUDGE KAPALA NOR DISTRICT JUDGE DUKKIN DISPUTED IT; RATHER THEY DELIBERATELY IGNORED IT.

GARUBA V. O'BRIEN 711 F.3d 751 (7th 2013) MADE QUITE CLEAR - GARUBA WAS SUING, FIRST AND FOREMOST, FOR VIOL. OF BOTH THE VPPA + DPPA. THEREAFTER, FALSE ARREST AND MALICIOUS ABUSE OF PROCESS -- NOT MALICIOUS PROSECUTION.

GARUBA V. NEESE 17CY50337 (NO.11), 18-3398, 19-2669 (7th) HAD DISTRICT JUDGE KAPALA (WRONGLY) CONCLUDE GARUBA'S BIRTHDATE OBTAINMENT WAS "INDEPENDENTLY SOURCED" FROM A "BOOKING PROCESS-VERSION" BY ADJUDGED FRANKS PERJURER ISP O'BRIEN WHEN THERE IS NO RECORD OF THIS OCCURRENCE BECAUSE IT SIMPLY NEVER HAPPENED. MAJUE PERJURY. GARUBA'S "BOOKING PROCESS" DENIAL AFFIDAVIT IS BRANDED "IRRELEVANT": THE RAREST DOG WHISTLE OF

IRRATIONALLY BIASED AND PREJUDICED IL STATE + FED'L JUDGES / COURTS. BIGOTRY.

THE WORD OF AN HONEST ACTUALLY INNOCENT POOR BLACK MAN IS INFERIOR TO THE WORD OF A CROOKED CORRUPT WHITE COP WHO COMMITTED FRANKS PERJURY 3x BY SUBMITTING FALSE AFFIDAVITS IN SUPPORT OF ALL 3 WARRANTS EVER OBTAINED IN THIS CASE. ACCORD

MILKE V. RYAN 711 F.3d 998 (9TH 2013) (COA, HABEAS GRANT: FABRICATED INCULPATORY STATEMENTS BY POLICE OFFICER W/ HISTORY OF LYING / PERJURY WARRANTS NEW TRIAL); BELLAMY V. CITY OF NY 914 F.3d 727 (2ND 2019) (\$1983 FOR FABRICATED EVIDENCE USED TO WRONGFULLY CONVICT).

SIMPLY PUT, GARUBA HAS BEEN BLACKBALLED BY THE IL STATE + FED'L COURTS. PROOF: IN 2013-14 GARUBA PERSISTED IN SEEKING EQUITABLE RELIEF CONSISTENT W/ AMAZON, DAHLSTROM, AND SEBINE V. PALATINE BY FILING SEVERAL PRO SE SUITS REFINING EACH TIME HIS PLEADINGS AS A LEGAL NEOPHYTE. RATHER THAN REVIEWING, MUCH LESS RECRUITING APPELLATE LAWYERS, THEY WERE DISMISSED W/O EXPLANATION OR REASONING. INSTEAD, THE USCA-7 THREATENED SANCTIONS TO STOP GARUBA'S QUEST TO UPHOLD, DEFEND HIS 7TH AMEND. RIGHT PER THE VPPA + DPPA. SEE GARUBA V. FARDON 14CV 50125 (NO. IL.), 14-02335 (7TH). THUS, THE IL DIST + CIRCUIT COURTS RENDER JUSTICE IN STERK I + II TRW REASONED REVIEW OF THE RESPECTIVE STATUTES -- VPPA (ESPECIALLY) -- BUT OBSCURATELY REFUSE TO DO LIKEWISE FOR GARUBA. SEE ALSO GARUBA V. NEESE ? (US 32T. 2019) (PRO SE CERTIORARI, MANDAMUS, SUPERVISORY ORDER OF GARUBA V. NEESE 18-3398, 19-2669 (7TH)).

THE ONLY RATIONAL REASON TO BLACKBALL GARUBA IS TO OBSTRUCT JUSTICE PER GARUBA V. O'BRIEN 12CV 7296 (NO. IL.) 13CV 50218 - GARUBA V. KARNER (NO. IL.). 7TH AMEND. RETALIATION VIOL. BECAUSE GARUBA'S BIRTHDATE WAS ILLEGALLY OBTAINED, THEN RECEIVED BEFORE STATE + FED'L GRAND JURIES IN VIOLATION OF 18 USC § 2710(d) BY THE SOLE GRAND JURY WITNESS -- ISP O'BRIEN -- GARUBA'S IL STATE CRIMINAL INDICTMENT IS VOID AB INITIO. ACCORD GARUBA V. BROWN 19CV 5429 (NO. IL.). VOID INDICTMENT = COURTS LACK JURISDICTION = JUDGE'S ABSOLUTE IMMUNITY IS LACKING TOO. SEE STERK 672 F.3d 535, 538 (7TH 2012) (§2710(d) VIOLATION DAMAGES WOULD ERASE JUDGE'S IMMUNITY)

CONCLUSION. THIS TRULY IS A CASE OF 7TH IMPRESSION W/ LOWER COURTS' DISREGARDING THE VPPA OR DIVIDED, CONFUSED IN THIS 31 Y.O. LAW'S ENFORCEMENT. CF. FISA SO USE §1806 (TO §2710(d)).

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: 9/9/20

PETER GAKUBA (M52946)
VIENNA CC
6695 STATE ST., 146E.
VIENNA, IL 62995