

No. _____

20-8249

ORIGINAL

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

APR 28 2021

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

BRITTIAN WILLIE YOUNG,
Petitioner

VS.

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY, et al.
Respondents

On Petition For A Writ of Certiorari To United States
Court of Appeals For The Ninth Circuit

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Brittian Willie Young #127930, ASPC-Tucson/Whetstone Unit
P.O. Box 24402
Tucson, AZ 85734-4402

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

BRITTIAN WILLIE YOUNG,
Petitioner

VS.

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY, et al.
Respondents

On Petition For A Writ of Certiorari To United States
Court of Appeals For The Ninth Circuit

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Brittian Willie Young #127930, ASPC-Tucson/Whetstone Unit
P.O. Box 24402
Tucson, AZ 85734-4402

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. • I would like the Court to review the due process of
2. law and applied equal protection of law concerning
3. whether or not it is ethical in duty of justice to use
4. illegal stricken statements to dismiss a claim as
5. frivolous even if and when evidence said otherwise?
6.

7. • I would like the Court to review the due process of
8. law and applied equal protection of law concerning
9. whether or not it is ethical in duty of justice to deny
10. motions to proceed in forma pauperis where there
12. is evidence to support that One has no source of income?
13.

14. • Is it not a violation of due process of law and equal
15. protection of that law where judicial ethics come into
16. question in the duty of justice, where Appellate Judge
17. use prior cases that U.S. judges ruled on to deny a
18. motion to proceed in forma pauperis, when the judges are
19. now parties to the case and listed as Respondents?
20.

21. • Is it not a violation to all, the henderance of prosecution
22. in duty of justice, and or is it not also derilition of duty?
23.

24. • Once court has been given notice of life changing injury
25. shouldn't One be on course of justice to achieve relief of
26. such, graced through the court.
27.
28.

LIST OF PARTIES

All parties do not appear in the caption of 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:

Brittian Willie Young, (Prepositional Negotiator for Open Entry Services), Petitioner

V.S.

David Shinn, (Director of ADOC); Charles L. Ryan, (Former Director of ADOC); Mark Brnovich, (State Attorney General); Carol Miller, (Commercial Property Manager); Lisa Daniel Flores, (Maricopa County Superior Court Judge); Dominic W. Lanza, (U. S. District Court Judge); Camil D. Bibbes, (U. S. District Court Judge); David G. Campbell, (Senior U. S. District Court Judge); State of Arizona, (a U. S. state and territory of U. S. administers three institutions): Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, Arizona Department of Child Safety, Arizona Department of Corrections, Arizona Limited Liability 4909 Beverly (Commercial Property)

• Respondents

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	OPINIONS	5
2.	JURISDICTION	6
3.	CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS	7
4.	STATEMENT OF THE CASE	8
5.	REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	9
6.	CONCLUSION	10

INDEX TO APPENDICES

9.	APPENDIX A	Order Of U.S. Court of Appeals Denying Motion
10.	APPENDIX B	Order Of U.S. Court of Appeals Dismissing Appeal
11.	APPENDIX C	Order of U.S. District Court Dismissing Cause
12.	APPENDIX D	Order Of U.S. District Court To Show Cause

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

U.S. Court of Appeals No. 20-17217

U.S. District Court of AZ No. CV-20-01721-PHX-DWL(JZB)

STATUTES AND RULES

Supre Court of the U.S. Rule 24

Rule 14

Rule 39

OTHER

Amendments 1, 6, 9, 14

28 U.S.C. § 1254 (1)

28 U.S.C. § 1915 (a)

28 U.S.C. § 351 (a)

1. IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
2. PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
3.

4. Petitioner respectfully gives grace that a writ of certiorari issue
5. to review the judgment orders below.
6.

7. OPINIONS
8.

9. For cases from federal courts, the opinion of the United States
10. court of appeals appears at Appendix A to the petition and is
11. reported at Order ; the opinion of the United States
12. ~~appeals~~ court appears at Appendix B to the petition and is
13. reported at Order .
14.

15. For cases from federal courts, the opinion of the United States
16. district court appears at Appendix C to the petition and is
17. reported at Order ; the opinion of the United States
18. district court appears at Appendix D to the petition and is
19. reported at Order .
20.
21.
22.
23.
24.
25.

JURISDICTION

For cases from federal courts, the date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was March 17, 2021; a timely motion for reconsideration was filed before mandate; the date on which the United States Court of Appeals ordered the denial of motion to proceed in forma pauperis was January 15, 2021; the jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g), 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1), and 28 U.S.C. § 351(a).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

In prepositional verbatim the constitutional provisions, treaties, statutes, ordinances and regulations involved in this case are graced in the PREAMBLE of the United States Constitution where one retains all rights as a U.S. citizen and Prepositional of the United States. These rights are held to be self-evident.

Amendments to the U.S. Constitution applied to Amendment I., freedom of speech; where one has the right to verbally express details in "Move To Strike" concerning conditions of violated contract in this case; Amendment IV., illegal search; where my child was endangered by State of Arizona; Amendment VI., right to confront witnesses against me; where testimony from officers of law were left out along with evidence, and my motion to proceed in forma pauperis was denied though one has no income and is without the ability to work according to 28 U.S.C. § 1915; Amendment IX., rights retained by people; where one is the Prepositional of the United States, and I have life changing injuries (U.S.C.S. Jud. Con. and Disab. Proc. 1-8); Amendment XIV., due process of law and equal protection of laws; where one applied a course of justice by contract and it was breached by Respondents with dereliction of duty; where judicial ethics are in question for duty of justice, according to 28 U.S.C.S. § 351(a). U.S.C.S. Jud. Con. and Disab. Proc. 1-8; Article II. Misconduct (28 U.S.C. § 351) see APPENDIX A.

UPHELD through Rules of the Supreme Court of the United States.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

As the Prepositional Negotiator for Open Entry Services, one has retained all rights sustained in the ninth Amendment; where one has executed a "Move To Strike" on State of Arizona officials for their involvement of child endangerment and fraud at a court hearing; the course of justice was interrupted by State of Arizona which then lead to Unlawful Conviction and Unlawful Imprisonment, where unsafe conditions of confinement lead to violation of my lock faith being cut off against my will, where sharp hair got in my eye and caused great irritation, where ADOC members questioned my faith and attacked because they didn't see my lock of faith; the attack left both knees badly injured, where I was later diagnosed with osteoarthritis. ADOC is not able to treat my life changing injuries, where conditions of confinement can now be viewed as cruel and unusual punishment; these conditions have also contributed to the deadly Corona virus, where some have died; One has tested positive, where it has been brought to Courts' attention by One; this is a dereliction of duty, where Judges had a duty of justice; Amendment XIV, due process of law and equal protection of laws was violated throughout this case repeatedly; One has not been afforded to present case to a jury to determine guilt or liability of Respondents, where motions to proceed in forma pauperis dated 11-24-2020 was denied on 1-15-2021, where on 3-17-2021, an order to dismiss appeal was filed; One filed motion for reconsideration 3-24-2021. Because of the violation of judicial ethics and dereliction of duty, where there was a duty of justice, U.S. District Court judges are now Respondents. (APPENDIX C)

REASON FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Petitioner as the Propositional of the United States has retained all rights in the ninth Amendment, hereby giving notice to the Supreme Court of the United States that there is a national conflict, where the Judicial Ethics of State of Arizona officials and U.S. official are in question. Through my own contract I initiated a course of justice in good faith executing a "Move To Strike," the fourteenth Amendment guarantees due process of law and equal protection of laws. Compelling reasons to grant motion to proceed in forma pauperis, where One has sustained life changing injuries that cause the inability to work and the ADOC does not have the ability to treat these life changing injuries, where it is now apacent that ADOC and ADEQ are now experimenting with conditions of confinement that lead to the spread of the Corona virus, where grace is vested in this court to exercise discretionary jurisdiction to determine guilt or liability of Respondents who violated federal law and have judicial ethics that are now in question. President Biden has justly signed in new executive orders to ensure equitable response, safe conditions to cover expansion of care and expenses which now makes the decisions of the lower courts erroneous.

President Biden signed those orders on January 21, 2021, where APPENIX A-D are in conflict with those applied by President Biden. Granting this certiorari is now needed to remain on the course of justice for it is important that due process be upheld to reverse lower court decision where it has errored. (see APPENDIX A-D)

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted, where illegal statements that had been stricken during jury trial had again been raised by the State of Arizona which brought into question professional conduct, where Respondents have a claim against them and a jury trial is appropriate to present all evidence to further prosecute this case, where Petitioner may be granted relief from these unsafe conditions with the reversal or vacation of orders in APPENDIX A-D, where one has no source of income and has sustained life changing injuries according to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a) and 28 U.S.C. § 351 a hearing on disability account should grant resolution: Any demands fit for recovery of unlawful and cruel conviction and imprisonment, overturn conviction, restore all rights, follow through with the execution on the "move to strike" on Respondents, full custody of child, all rights to 4909 E. Beverly Property, compounded accumulated interest value of lost video, Recovery of "Memocabilia of Faith" value interest, Orthopaedic care expenses, Electric special need scooter, transportation van with special needs access ramp, Order the State of Arizona to construct commercial complex at 4909 E. Beverly Phx. AZ 85044 with special needs access, provide a walk-in jet stream tub for special needs, and any other relief invested through this court necessary for the recovery of One that sustained life changing injuries to both knees.

Gracefully forwarded this day 5-19-2021 by Brittan Willie Young

NA Brittan Willie Young

page 10 of 10