

In The Supreme Court Of The
United States
Curtis Jerome Brown, Sr. #238979
Pro Se Petitioner / Affiant
Vs.
United States Of America

Clerk Of Court Susan Frimpong
Case: 20-7141

Certificate Of Good Faith Under
Rule 44, And Rule 40, Supreme
Court Rules; Petition For Rehearing

Defendants,

ex parte

Petitioner Come with my Certificate under Rule 40 Veterans And Rule 44.
Rehearing, And that the grounds are limited to intervening Circumstances
Of Substantial or Controlling effect or to other Substantial grounds not
previously presented, And is presented in good faith And not for delay.


(1) Petitioner States the Solicitor General is promissory estoppel, and det-
rimental estoppel, And estoppel, And the Government have Committed extrin-
sic Fraud in my entire proceedings in Federal and State Courts And have for
25 years kept me from fully And fairly presenting my Case because I was
pro se And I am A Veteran with an honorable Discharge ever since 1968-69,
And Am innocent.

(2) My Life is in Peril And Subject to loss, And All the Federal Officials are
in Violation of extortion under 18 USC 2, And Judge David C. Norton of 28 U.S.C.
& 455, And have Conflict of interest for 25 years.

(3) My 1st, 4th, 5th, 14th, 6th, And 8th Amendments are Violated under 28 USC
& 2255 And F.Crim.R. 32.1 is Violated.

I swear under 18 USC 1621 All Statements are Absolutely true And Correct.

Respectfully Submitted 4-13-21
Curtis J. Brown, Sr.
Kershaw Corr. Inst. PB 01
4848 Goldmine Hwy.
Kershaw, S.C. 29067



IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

BROWN, CURTIS JEROME, SR.
Petitioner

vs.

No: 20-7141

USA

WAIVER

The Government hereby waives its right to file a response to the petition in this case,
unless requested to do so by the Court.

ELIZABETH B. PRELOGAR
Acting Solicitor General
Counsel of Record

February 22, 2021

cc:

CURTIS J. BROWN
238979
KERSHAW CORRECTIONAL
INSTITUTION
4843 GOLDMINE HWY
KERSHAW, SC 29067

In The Supreme Court Of The
United States
Curtis Jerome Brown, Sr. #238979
Pro-se Petitioner/Affiant
Vs.
United States Of America, et Al.

Defendants,

Clerk Of Court Susan Fimping
Case No.: 20-7141

Nunc pro Tunc Supplemental
Brief In Opposition To denial
Under Express Waiver Of
Solicitor General Rule 40(1),
18 & 3006 A, Appointment Of
Counsel, Pro Se For Writ Of
Certiorari, Rehearing Rule 44.
3-29-21 Ex parte

Petitioner here by Nunc pro tunc with my Supplemental briefs under Rule 16, Rule 15(5), Rule 13, 28 U.S.C. § 1651 enforce the Government waiver in this case under promissory estoppel and estoppel for release from prison under Article III, as a Federal prisoner from State prison.

The Solicitor General Elizabeth B. Prelogar Counsel of record relinquish her right voluntarily under Rule 15(5) the express waiver and is estoppel and like a cloak, it covers a multitude of sins. The defendants have tried to kill me over 14 times in over 25 years and I am a Federal prisoner, and never was a State prisoner, and I am kidnapped under Article 9, Chapter 3, Title 16, Code of Laws of South Carolina, 1976 sec. 16-3-920, Sec. 16-3-910 for 25 years illegally, and my wife is still in danger. The Government is estoppel from denying this case.

Petitioner request Cost of Completion, Accruing Costs, and transaction Cost under Trezevant v. City of Tampa, 741 F.R.T 2nd 336, and my Release from prison Nunc pro tunc under the infringement of Cases CIR no.: 2:74-22, C/A No. 2:20-CV-2121 DCN under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 as a Federal prisoner unconditional for release under 18 & 872; Fed. False Claim Act violation 18 & 286-287, Veterans U.S.M.C. From payment of Fees or Court Costs under Rule 40, and Appointment of Counsel under 18 & 3006 A, Rule 41, Rule 42, Rule 43, and Judgment, that imposes personal liabilities on defendants under the Civil and Criminal Conspiracy, Forfeiture.

My right to testify and right to Counsel goes to essence of a Fair trial and may be reviewed to Vacate Sentence. Mason v. U.S., 1951, 193 F. 2d 23, 90 U.S. App. D.C. 1. They won't let me use Appointed Counsel. Is Dred Scott v. Sanford still Constitutional law? 28 & 455 Violation

LEGAL MAIL

(2)

Evidently Clerk Scott S. Harris did not distribute the documents in my Case For An Order Summary disposition on the Merits, under Rule 16, or 155. I am a Veteran under Military Case of the U.S. Marines, under 28 U.S.C. § 1259 And Am innocent and kidnapped by Federal Judge David C. Norton, And Framed And Lynched. I Ask For leave to proceed in Forme Papperis in this Case? See Forgery of Arrest warrants.

Solicitor General Relinquished the government right And Surrender For my release under reliance and promisory estoppel based on detrimental reliance and representations causing the worsening of my position And I would request Susan Frimpong Case Analyst to enforce the Solicitor general's promise in this case under the estoppel under the Waiver And promise of the Contract, and estoppel, under Manifest injustice And violation of my 1st, 4th, 5th, 6th, 8th and 14th Amendments AS A Veteran under Manifest weight of the evidence Submitted in this Case under the Vinculum Juris And promisory estoppel. Petitioner request legal effect.

Clerk Scott S. Harris denial of a Certiorari has no right being denied, And should be affirmed. See UCC § 9-102(A). Parties who file no documents will not qualify for any relief from this Court, Rule 12.7, 12.2. The Government's lawyer repudiate And renounce their obligation And duty.

I swear under Perjury 18 § 1601 All Statements Are Absolutely true to the best of my knowledge. Solicitor General signed Waiver Feb. 22, 2001.

Respectfully Submitted 3-29-21
Curtis J. Brown, Sr.
Kershaw Corr. Inst. PB 01
4848 Goldmine Hwy.
Kershaw, S.C. 29067

Footnote: There is Also Forgery of All the Arrest warrants A year After they were issued, And my transcripts were Mutilated impaired, And interpolated, and back dated 20 years when there was never any Crimes Committed, And I was forced into A kangaroo Court And illegally given 20 years And kidnapper under S.C. law, And All my Charges was dismissed And dropped Nov. 21, 1996. Government is estoppel by Contract. Is Dred Scott vs. Sanford Still Constitutional Law? I am a Veteran of the Marine Corps, kidnapped by a Federal Judge And State Judges. In union there is Strength. I am being held against my will with no Charges.

In The Supreme Court of U.S.
Curtis Jerome Brown, Sr. #238979
Pro se Petitioner / Affiant

Vs
United States of America; et al

Clerk of Court Susan Primpong
Case No: 20-7141

Motion for In Forma Pauperis And
Affidavit, And Affidavit of Proof
of Service, Affidavit Under Rule
40.1, Rehearing Rule 44.

Defendants,

ex parte

Petitioner request proceedings in Forma Pauperis under Rule 39, Supreme Court and Rule 40. Petitioner requested and never in my incarceration given in 25 years in a widespread Criminal and Civil Conspiracy between Federal Judge David C. Norton and Federal Officials, and State Judges, Any Lawyers or representation by Federal or State Public Defenders at all, and I never had legitimate lawyers under the 6th Amendment, and kept under the radar for 25 years, in union there is strength, against my will as a Federal prisoner, and still am nunc pro tunc. I am also a U.S.M.C Veteran with an Honorable Discharge From the U.S. Marines Corps. These people involved has attempted to kill me over 14 times in 25 years.

I am serving proof of services of this Affidavit on the Solicitor General of the United States, Room 5614, Department of Justice, 950 Pennsylvania Ave. N.W. Washington, DC 20530-0001, and the Supreme Court Judges of the Supreme Court to Clerk of Court Susan Primpong because of conflict of interest of Scott S. Harris at Supreme Court of the United States Office of the Clerk of my nunc pro tunc Supplemental Brief In Opposition to denial under Express Waiver of Solicitor General Rule 40.1; 1883006A Appointment of Counsel Pro se For Writ of Certiorari Ex parte. I swear under Perjury And 1821621.

Respectfully Submitted 3-29-21

Curtis J. Brown, Sr.

Kershaw Court Inst PB 01

4848 Goldmine Hwy.

Kershaw, S.C. 29067

I never Agreed to dismiss my Case under Rule 46 and never will Agree to dismiss it.

RECEIVED

APR - 6 2021

CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.