

20-8023

No. \_\_\_\_\_

Supreme Court, U.S.

FILED

APR 16 2021

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. Re: Gause — PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

vs.

Eric A Hook et al — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

U.S. Court of Appeals No: 20-7772  
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Mr. Walter T. Gause  
(Your Name)

527 Commerce Dr.  
(Address)

Elizabeth City NC, 27906  
(City, State, Zip Code)

— NA —  
(Phone Number)

ORIGINAL

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

Mr. Pace AM pose. layman of  
law, Assertion, Unconstitutional Unlawful  
Xerxes AM HABEAS Petition, Amend +  
file With fed Dist Ct. in the  
Ments, of negotics

Mr Pace present following Questn is  
Actual innocent Assertion on Amend  
Habers' petition, And Other Classic Act  
of fundamental Misconstrue of Justice.  
Is AM Unauthorized Succession petition  
or AM Amend per. Rules established  
By fed Court. Are The forth Princ. Person  
Is Able of Desecration Plain error?

## 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:

- 1) U.S. Court of Appeal fourth Cir.
- 2) US. Dist Ct. char DN.
- 3) NC Court of Appeals, Raleigh North Carolina, 27699
- 4) Meck Cnty Superior Court. Charlotte, NC. 28202
- 5) NC Court Div. Dept of Justice Raleigh NC, 27699

## RELATED CASES

- 1) Gause v. Penny. 3:16-cv. 631 fDW,
- 2) Gause v. Penny. 17-6249.
- 3) Gause v. Hook et Al. 3:20-cv-306 - MA  
Gause v. Hook et Al. 20-7772
- 4) Gause v. Hook et Al, 3:19-cv-341 fDW.
- 5) Gause v. Murray et Al. 3:18-cv-378 fDW.
- 6) Gause v. Hook et Al. 3:20-cv-507 MA
- 8) U.S. Supreme Court. Certiorari petition - filed  
NOV. 21- 2017. fourth Cir. NO: 17-6249

## 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 A.Cir judgment. et seq.

APPENDIX B U.S. Dist Ct. Prelim And judgment

APPENDIX C Informal Brief, re 2e filing. A.Cir

APPENDIX D U.S. Dist Ct. habeas petition. (Dkt# 3) 306-M

APPENDIX E U.S. Dist Ct. Amad petition Order

Brief on merits. (Dkt# 7# 9 # 10 # 11) 306-M.

APPENDIX F Motion with petition Court filed Nov. 21-2017.  
with Court. No: 17-6249

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
MAYIA V. Felix, (2005)	passim
Pittman V. US, (2000)	11
Reyn V. US, (2017)	11
Conc V. Bell (2009)	
MATTHEW V. EVARTH (1997)	

### STATUTES AND RULES

fed & City Proc 5(c) et seq. Brief on Mgmt. And  
Informal Brief. Office Inc.

\$ 2254(b)(1)(A)(ii)

\* 2253 et seq

¶ 2243. et seq.

¶ 2211

\$ Fam Proc. 52(b)

### OTHER

Cutter Cert Pet. filed Nov. 21. 2017, Inc.

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 \_\_\_\_\_; 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 B 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 15 April 2021.

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: 1 April 2021, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix A.

An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including \_\_\_\_\_ (date) on \_\_\_\_\_ (date) in Application No. 26 A 7772.

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

*U.S. Constitution, 14th Am't, Art III § 1 § 2. Court  
Rules 10 and 17. Authority, Maya V. Felix, (2005)  
FRCiv Proc. 8, 12(c) and 15(c) et seq, Authority  
Cone v. Bell (2009) § 2254(b)(1)(A)(ii)*

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

- 1) U.S. Const Art III, § 1 & 2
- 2) L.S. Const Art VI Cl. 2.
- 3) L.S. Const Amend, 14th, 6th 5th 4th And 8th Amend.
- 4) Fed R. Civ. Proc. 8(c) & 15(c)
- 5) Fed R. Crim. Proc. 52(b)
- 6) § 28 USCA § 2111
- 7) § 88 USCA § 1254 et seq
- 8) § 28 USCA § 1257 et seq
- 9) § 28 USCA § 2243 et seq
- 10) § 28 USCA § 2242. et seq
- 11) § 28 USCA § 2247 et seq
- 12) § 28 USCA § 2253 et seq
- 13) § 28 USCA § 2254 et seq

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Mr. Bruce, on every level, Assertion, of -  
Constitutional Violation signs. By Malic  
Wilful Misconduct. By State North Carolina  
Adm of Justice, joint participant. Collusion. By  
State official et Al, Malfeasance, Mr. Bruce  
HAVE SHOWN. Court. Constitutional illegal false  
imprisonent. By fraudulent fabricated evidence, Manu-  
factured, to Convicted, By deceptn. And fraud  
in the procure. due the larger Judicial Court  
Misconduct, Mr. Bruce HAVE RAISE & SHOWN  
Court Constitutional Due process Violatn. And  
The Court Continue to Turn Mr. Blinded eyes  
to An No se Lawyer. who SHOWN AN  
deliberated Manifest injustice, which dont Compt  
With dictation of Due process of Constitutional  
Law

## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

- 1) Mr. Bruce, Complainant, Assault, Actual —  
INNOCENCE
- 2) Mr. Bruce Conviction is obtained By Misuse  
AND Abuse of Authority, By State officials of All  
inequalities

— The Court, Sworn, of Liberty Justice is  
Empower to Correct. Classic Act fundamental  
MISSCALCULATE of Justice, AND to ABATE  
This flagrantly ASSAULT. Admin upon THE —  
Constitution. Which I don't think it  
can not withstand, THE Court is  
empower pursuee Constitution. to Correct  
Any manifest disregard of Const Law.

## **CONCLUSION**

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark T. Gare

Date: 9th April 2021