

No. 20-2414
20-7540
20-432

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES


ORIGINAL

Anthony Vore Carb — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

Danny Ferguson — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO



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

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Anthony Vore Carb
(Your Name)

P.O. Box 244
(Address)

Collegeville Pa 19420
(City, State, Zip Code)

(Phone Number)

9

Questions Presented

Was the Circuit Court in error when it dismissed this case without Mr. Caiby ever having an opponent?

Ans. Yes.

Was the Circuit Court in error when it decided to dismiss Mr. Caiby's case for failure to state a claim upon which relief could be granted when he alleged; criminal acts without any discovery; holding him to proof without giving him such?

Ans. Yes.

Was the Circuit Court in error when it went against two prior decisions to Remand cases by Mr. Caiby with the same topic **18-2396 *Caiby V. Haidle et al.***, and **18-2876 *Caiby V. Link et al.***, counting the disqualified Judges who correctly ruled to remand, and leave the circuit with a bad decision for decades handcuffing them. See: **Fed R. App P. Rule 35 Section 46 (C), 28 U.S.C. 2073 (B)**

Ans. Yes.

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:

RELATED CASES

19-2414, 18-423 Ceily V. Ferguson et al.
18-01120, 18-2396 Ceily V. Harde et al.
18-2876, 18-CV-132 Ceily V. Link et al.
18-CV-644 Ceily V. Harde et al.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|---|
| OPINIONS BELOW | 1 |
| JURISDICTION..... | |
| CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED | |
| STATEMENT OF THE CASE | |
| REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT | |
| CONCLUSION..... | |

INDEX TO APPENDICES

| | |
|------------|-------------------------------|
| APPENDIX A | <i>Oases</i> |
| APPENDIX B | <i>28 W.C.S. 46 (C)</i> |
| APPENDIX C | <i>AD# 2018-0064</i> |
| APPENDIX D | <i>Things were in Phoenix</i> |
| APPENDIX E | <i>Memorandum</i> |
| APPENDIX F | <i>Certificate of Service</i> |

Cited on Page No. 7

Appendix

I Opinion of 12/24/20 Cady V. Ferguson et al

19-2414

II Correspondence 1/14/20 14-2414 Cady V. Ferguson et al.

III ^{Opinion} Correspondence from 12/24/14 Cady V. Ferguson et al

19-2414

IV Correspondence of 9/24/20 Cady V. Ferguson et al.

19-2414

V Opinion from 15-2876 Remanding Cady V. Link et al similar case.

VI Correspondence Cady V. Ferguson, 14-2414 10/5/20

VII Opinion Ine Petition for Rehearing 19-2414 Cady V. Ferguson et al. 19-2414

VIII Cady V. Ferguson et al 19-423 Order 5-2/2019

IX Order Cady V. Ferguson et al 19-423 5/2/19

X Important facts

XI Declaration of Anthony Vore Cady 15-2876

Appendix

XII 28 CMC 846 (C)

XIII AP # 2018-0064 City V. Monroe
County

XIV Thing done in Phoenix

XV Memorandum 19-423 City V. Ferguson et al.

XVI Certificate of service

XVII Certification

total pages 66

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

Shenker V. Baltimore & Ohio R.R. Co. 374 U.S. 1 (1963) (17)

U.S. V. Reynolds, 345 U.S. 1 (1953) (17C20)

Western Pacific Ry. Co. V. Western Co., 345 U.S. 247 (1953)

Natural Cable & Telecom Assoc. Inc. V. Calif. Pacific Power
4435 U.S. 307 (2007) (17)

NRDC V. EPA, 454 F.3d 1 (D.C. Cir. 2007) (17)

STATUTES AND RULES

28 C.S. § 46 (C)

WAP 35

PJ# 47-48-17

OTHER

AP# 2018-0064 Carby V. Murue County

10
PJ# 49-56

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 19-2414; 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 3 to the petition and is

- ☐ reported at 19-423; 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 8-24-20.

☐ 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: 12-8-19, 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 2-8-21 (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. A.

Not submitted properly 60 days to comply twice

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

The Constitutional, and Statutory and Constitutional provisions involved are that the Court was in constant, to the point that two other cases had been remanded back to the District Court for a brief of reason or that they were the trial the other was that they were settled.

One from Monroe County the others from St. Croix County with the same Unconstitutional Policies/Programs of a failure to train as they trained their staff in illegal unconstitutional tactics.

This left the District under 28 U.S.C. § 46 (c) of leaving this Circuit with no way for people to blow the whistle or tell about the Unobvious thus this needs to be reversed so that people can tell and save others.

Statement of The Case

This case involves whether or not you can not have an opponent in a civil case, another is can there be, a case where criminal charges are alleged and nothing be done by the courts to rectify the wrongs committed to the victim(s). Another is can a defendant be put to discovery without first being granted discovery especially when the defendants are either the perpetrators, or at the acquiesce, to criminal, criminal behavior, criminality, or allow a culture or Policy of such that is Unconstitutional to exist, thrive or otherwise be in place, and excepted or permitted *de facto de Jure* or otherwise?

There are records that exist as well as there are two prior decisions by the same Circuit court remanding similar cases back to the District Court, See: **AP#2018-0064 *Caiby V. Monroe County***, Pa OOR *Final decision* of 9-28-2018, Jordan R. Davis Esq. Appeals Counsel Appx. ____, as well as **18-CV-132, 18-2876, *Caiby V. Link et al.*; 18-01120, 18-2396, *Caiby V. Haidle et al.***

All of the above established the standing to allow for me to bring suit in court the theory was an Unconstitutional Policy/Custom/Pattern, along with things that fall under the Military/State's Secrets Doctrines. I had independent that prove my allegations; again in **AP#2018-0064**. Two prior cases were already remanded back to the District Court in my humble opinion it was to hand cuff the courts with a bad decision for decades to come.

I also have further independent proof of this via satellite video # **77837421321770921-7-12-13-present**

15

The folowin are some other numbers that you can call for independent verification, most of it falls under the "Military Secrets Doctrine", as it involves technology that is not readily known to man; or the population at large, however i assure you that it exist, and that they are refining, and perfecting these sciences etc. . . .; to be able to unleash them on an unsuspecting public. Most of the things done can only be described, but they are ouside of the excepted or known possibilities that are geerally known. they are advanced, and they should not be called dellusional, just because the person is not familliar with them or they are, and they are just playing it off as if they don't know. either way this is dangerous, and requires experts to be able to inform the court that this is real, and not the wild rantings, and prevarivations of a lunatic. They are all based in science, and so they should be respected as such. The numbers, to confirm were and are provided again.

This issue involves a matter of great public importance, **Rule 35 (a)** of the federal rules of appellate procedure provide that en banc consideration are reserved for cases where it is needed "To secure or maintain uniformity of the courts sessions." (i.e., a decision conflicts with other decisions of the same appeals court, and cases that involve a question of 'exceptional importance' e.g. the *decision is in conflict of authorative decisions of other Federal Appeals Courts 35(b)*. **R. App.P. SEE: Western Pcific Ry Pac Co V. Western Pacific Co, 345 U.S. 247 (1953), Natural Cable & Telecom Asoc. Inc. V. Gulf Pacific Power, 435 U.S. 327 (2007) also NRDC V. EPA, 454 F.3d 1 9D.C. Circ. 2006)**

See: Also U.S. V. Reynolds, 345 U.S. 1 (1953) the, court did not give me a chance to proove any of my allegations without being put to proof my argument is that how can I as a prisoner, and a ward of the state be expected to find out who is responsible for what the sheer number of times that i was cut eaisly allows for the inference that they were solocited by whom? These solicitations are a part of a larger conspiracy, one to commit them the other to cover them up in a vail of silence, that has become an Unconstitutional Policy/Custom/pattern that is in effect in this prison thus obstructing justice.

most of my cuts were qualifications (small cuts [and a form of torture within itself, and ancient on at that]) done with "*dull point instrumrnts*" to the "*Burn Censor Third Cuticle Down*" this is a secret form of torture the design of which is to leave a permanent burning sensation in the victim thus torturing them for ever. To avoid this you have to pick, and pull to allow the wound to heal from the inside otu this again falls unedr the "*Military Secrets Doctrine*" and calls for experts to be consulted the two lower failed to do that.

so for the court to say that i failed to make a statement upon which reliedf can be granted the erred, because how can I the victim of assault gain recompense for the my injuries suffered if the courts rebuff me; this is a denail of my day in court; See: U.S. Art II 2 also ***Fitzgerald V. Penthouse ltd., 776 F.2d 1236 (4th Circ. 1985)***, again two other similar cases by me were

18

others and other cognitive ability high-jackers, along with brain-mining, and the targeting of the pleasure-center, done with the above in the above manner to cause mania, psycho, clepto, nempfo, and other things subtly done to make people think that thoughts, and behaviors are their own especially immoral ones.

This is what i have said in the past, for which the lower courts have ignored, they have never consulted an expert to see if anything I said was true. see investigative file No. **77839218764324911832-7-5-12-Present. T.O.N.I. 3434** call numbers preveiously provided.

This is why I have been continuously attacked, and for which I have spoken out against, reporting assaults that they have ignored, Thier rationale is that I failed to make a claim upon which relief may be granted. I explained and for which two other cases were remanded back to the lower courts, so the inconsistancy must be noted the two cases are listed **18-2396**, and **18-2876** both remanded, this decision to me seem like a way to saddle the area, and the region fotr which the courts jurisdiction lies with a bad decision for decades.

Then who can complain to warn the courts and the public, all of my claims are based in science, and fact, so they should not be dismissed by the courts as frivolous without them consulting those in the know, in that case the *Military*, and not the regular *Military*, there was a cleras policy that was established that was Unconsitutional, the staff/administration did not invsetigate all thorough warned in several ways by me via grievance, law suit, and **DC-ADM 135** request slip.

They put me to a proof beyond what is required by the courts this should not have occured

179
Decabalizing to cause blocages in the neurons to impede the storage of information, and memories, the spreading of diseases to cause oligo-synaptic-blockages, electric-minin, radiation vents, to steal electricity from the human body, which runs off of electric, that produces it through thermo-genesis converting the carbons in the food into electric, like a coal-power, plant through aceting, like a battery when the body turns water into urine.

Globin, and sebum mask, to steal the sebum in the skin, and the other natural oils, out of the skin, and hair. Tele-medicine, ran with algorithms, to make, and keep people sick. telegia, aka satellite pain. cerebellum wrapping, that affects complex voluntary movement, so that ones movements are stiff, and robotic. toggle-switching, and the giving of command orders, causing non-compos-mentis or temporary insanity, and the remote-high-jacking of the brain.

It is literally, the turning, and switching off of the cerebral-cortex, causing vertical lystigmus, it is literally the de-evolution the human mind, as you think more primitive, and impulsive, as opposed to contemplative, and reflective; this is where thinking occurs, as opposed to again the less-evolved limbic system the seat of training, and reflex, without thinking., or weighing ones options.

Our brains as humans on the plains or savanas, as hunter-gathers, would react to a perceived threat, in whatever way one was usually trained or conditioned to react in or in how much of a threat was presented, fight-or-flight; so that we could pass our genes on. Ion pincers are coursed through the neural pathways to cause emotions, and behaviors. You can also make someone o.d. by coursing these electro-chemicals through the wrong peg, or receptor, you can tell by the warping of the pegs.


Eye portal watching, and vision manipulation, and ailments given, like aphasia, apoxia, and

discovery , the sick-call slips should have been enough. There was also inconsistent decisions as two of the other cases were remanded back to the District Court. If you look at what happened you could see that. this was a bad decision. this case involves issues of great public importance; it also has a "Military secrets" component ala *U.S. V. Reynolds* , and this is the essence of this case. I also have independent proof so the case should have not been dismissed without the Commonwealth asking for independent experts to ascertain whether or not the allegations were baseless.

To do what I described above was both unfair, and illegal, and placed a lot of people in danger. As all I was trying to do was tell bringing the cases to the court as **3434 24232** Anthony Vone CAIBY.

I hope that this is enough right now I am jammed at the parcels, and my eye sockets are being manipulated so as to slow me down; as well as my library access is limited; so bare with me. I do pray that this is looked at seriously, and passed along to experts who are knowledgeable who can educate and guide the court; by enlightening them. Thank you have a wonderful day.

Respectfully Submitted ,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Anthony Vone Caiby', written over a horizontal line.

Anthony Vone Caiby

Pro se

29

Concise Statement with
Reasons for This Case to Be Accepted

The case should be accepted

The reason why this case should be accepted is that the decisions are inconsistent with the two other decisions rendered by the same court; two different panels decided in **18-2396 Caibty V. Haidle et al.**; and **18-2876 Caiby V. Link et al.**; in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. This disqualified most of the court's Judges for my *en banc* hearing, that allowed the court even though the above occurred, and per rule **35 (a)**, and **28 U.S.C. 2703 (B)**, this decision as envisioned by the court, in its foresight saw that this could happen this is the case at hand.

And so now the Circuit, loops power to decide other similar cases with merit simply because of a bad decision. I hope that this court catches that error before it is too late, I had no opponent, so the court denied me by herself. I think this to be unconstitutional, and thus ask the court to rule on such. As well as being assaulted being declared to have no merit, in violation of my social contract same as us all.

So the next question is do I as a prisoner reserve that right to be free from assault in person, and body? I pray that your decision is wise. Thank you have a wonderful day.

Respectfully Submitted,



Anthony Vone Caiby

Pro Se

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Anthony Van Cauty

Date: 1/24/21