

Supreme Court, U.S.

FILED

MAR 17 2022

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

21-1481

No. -----

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

John Destin Alexander
Petitioner

v.

Department of the Army
U.S. Army Health Services Command
Walter Reed National Military Medical Center
Respondents

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

John Destin Alexander
Tamarind Literary Works
PO Box 5591
Baltimore, MD 21285-5591
443 602 1428

(i)

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

1. Can the government impose and maintain thirty years of involuntary servitude imprisonment upon an American citizen without filing any charges against that citizen; an ordinary American citizen who has committed no offense against the government?
2. Can the government for thirty years invade and deny privacy to the Petitioner (both in his private residence, and in public settings) for medical and psychological research purposes; for the punitive purpose of maintaining the Petitioner in involuntary servitude imprisonment?
3. Can the government elicit the public apparatus of state and local government (employment centers, bus and rail transportation, and business establishments) in its involuntary servitude imprisonment of the Petitioner? Can it utilize interstate transportation to hinder the public privacy of the Petitioner? Can it nationally deploy "participant people" to hinder the public privacy of the Petitioner?
4. Can the government impede a literary business, **Tamarind Literary Works**, from its ability to publish and sell books, because the government does not like some of its content; because **Tamarind Literary Works** provides a voice for the Petitioner amid the misuse of power by government?

(ii)

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS

All PARTIES appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.

PROCEEDINGS IN OTHER COURTS

1. John Destin Alexander v. Department of the Army, U.S. Army Health Services Command, Walter Reed Military Medical Center, No. 21-2131 (1:21-cv-02285-DLB), U.S. Court of Appeals For The Fourth Circuit, Judgement Entered 12/22/21.
2. John Destin Alexander v. Department of the Army, et.al., No, DLB-21-2285, U.S. District Court of Maryland, Judgement Entered 9/24/21.
3. John Destin Alexander v. Walter Reed Army Medical Center, No. 97-2531, U.S. Court of Appeals For The Fourth Circuit, Judgement Entered February 26, 1998.
4. John Destin Alexander v. Walter Reed Army Medical Center, No. MJG-97-3090, U.S. District Court of Maryland, Judgement Entered October 3, 1997.

(iii)

Corporate Disclosure Statement

A corporate disclosure statement was previously filed
in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit,
(21-2131 1:21-cv-02285-DLB).

(iv)

Basis of Jurisdiction

The United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit issued its decision on December 22, 2021. The Petitioner files within ninety days of the Fourth Circuit decision. The Supreme Court's jurisdiction is thereby invoked.

Table of Contents

- (i) Questions Presented For Review
- (ii) Parties and Proceedings in Other Courts
- (iii) Corporate Disclosure Statement
- (iv) Basis of Jurisdiction
- (v) Table of Contents
- (vi) Table of Cited Authorities
- 1. Statement of the Case
- 7. Appendix
 - A. U.S. Court of Appeals For The Fourth Circuit, Judgement, 12/22/21
 - B. U.S. District Court of Maryland, Order, 9/24/21
 - C. U.S. Court of Appeals For The Fourth Circuit, Judgement, 2/26/98.
 - D. U.S. District Court of Maryland, Order, 10/3/97.
 - E. A Synopsis of **THE NOT ME CONSPIRACY**, Tamarind Literary Works, John Destin Alexander, 2003, unpublished.
 - F. Tamarind Literary Works
- 8. Footnotes - References

(vi)

Table of Cited Authorities

1. Title 18, USC, Chapter 19, Conspiracy,
Chapter 13, Civil Rights,
Chapter 110A, Stalking
2. *Hague v. Congress of Industrial Organizations* (1937).
3. *Cox v. Louisiana* (1965)
4. *United States v. U.S. District Court*, 407 U.S. 297 (1972).
5. *Edwards v. South Carolina*, 372 U.S. 229 (1963).
6. *New York Times Co. v. United States*, 403 U. S. 713 (1971).

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

A thirty-year endurance of a government conspiracy, and the veracity of the Petition which attests to it, can correctly be characterized as unjust, as inhumane, as involuntary servitude, as a thirty-year violation of privacy, as a violation of freedom of the press, as surreptitious perniciousness; but certainly, but absolutely, is not frivolous,

It is a government conspiracy engineered deceptively of gamesmanship purpose, using military and civilian "people participants", to destroy the life and contribution of an ordinary American.

It is a failed conspiracy which continues.

Title 18, United States Code, Chapter 19, Conspiracy, Chapter 13, Civil Rights, Chapter 110A, Stalking, and Constitutional law promulgated of First, Fourth, Thirteenth, and Fourteenth Amendments; as well as the inherent right of privacy, represent the overriding legal embodiments of this case, thereby rendering the decisions of the Lower Courts reversible. Lower Court decisions which have the wrongful legal effect of denying the Petitioner the inherent right of privacy, of imprisoning the Petitioner in involuntary servitude, without charge, without right of habeas corpus; of violating freedom of the press.

It is a government lack of privacy infliction upon the Petitioner to serve wrongful medical and psychological research; it is a concealed malice spread openly as gamesmanship; it is a thirty year failed effort to dominate a free individual within an involuntary servitude imprisonment; it is an unlawful reprisal against an innocent ordinary American.

The Petitioner continues to be subjected to “people stalking”, and “orchestrated annoyances”, in a continuous effort to aggravate, to “stress” an individual unto his own death; with no government accountability for his death; it is a deceptive publicly entrenched destructive intent carried out surreptitiously by a pernicious government, using people participants, most of whom are unaware of the real intent of their actions.

The Petitioner cites the existence of case law and statutory authority which uphold the right of an ordinary American citizen to have privacy; and states that the inherent privacy rights of an ordinary American who has not committed any offense against the government is the superseding and reversible issue.

“In *Edwards v. South Carolina*, 372 U.S. 229 (1963) the Supreme Court addressed the liberty of Americans to assemble peaceably on public property and the governing legal principles were the protections provided by the First Amendment.” 1

Freedom from public harassment, freedom of peaceful assembly, has previously been upheld by the Supreme Court; yet the Petitioner is unable to peaceably assemble himself, whether it be in a commercial establishment, on public streets, or to sit quietly on a park bench.

“The right to be let alone is a fundamental right, a precedent right in common law, which then infuses our Constitution”. 2
Justice William O. Brendan wrote “The right to be let alone is indeed the beginning of all freedom”. 3

In *Hague v. Congress of Industrial Organizations* (1937), the Supreme Court protected public streets as gathering places, as areas of peaceful assembly; yet for thirty-years the government has deployed “participant people” to deny the Petitioner freedom of peaceful assembly in these public environments, in these public settings, and has waged a psychological “people war” against the Petitioner, violating his inherent right of privacy, his freedom of peaceful assembly.

A 1965 case, *Cox v. Louisiana*, also protected streets and sidewalks for peaceful assembly.

Yet how can the Petitioner peacefully assemble himself on public streets when a conspiratorial government for thirty-years has openly deployed participant people to maintain a psychological interference with his well-being, with his right of privacy, with his right to be let alone.

“We cannot exercise freedom of speech, assembly, or religion without an antecedent right to privacy, which creates an inviolable zone that government, or other power and interest, dare not trespass” 4

In the words of Justice Douglas “privacy and personal independence are inseparable” 5

“Throughout the history of civil liberties in the United States, the standard the Supreme Court uses when reviewing the procedure the government followed in adopting a policy, or interacting with a citizen, must be one of “fairness”; this standard is central to the principle of “procedural due process.” 6

In *United States v. United States District Court*, 407 U.S. 297 (1972), the Supreme Court ruled that even in cases involving national security, a court order was required to permit electronic surveillance; yet the Petitioner has been kept under electronic surveillance and people surveillance for thirty years, without charge, without right of habeas corpus.

"Under the legal concept known as "substantive due process", courts may void government action and policies, even though the action or policy does not violate an explicit Constitutional provision." 7

In the Petitioner's case, the "rule of reason" has been disregarded to contain an individual in involuntary servitude as a reprisal measure; to keep the Petitioner from obtaining any subsequent employment following his wrongful termination at Walter Reed Army Medical Center; to conduct medical experimentation upon the Petitioner; to restrain his alternative economic endeavors; to eliminate the Petitioner's right of privacy; to deny his freedom of peaceful assembly.

It is an unreasonable government action carried out surreptitiously, carried out punitively, carried out each day for thirty years continuously (for what reasonable government, what 'fairness' government, what just government, what accountable government, would wastefully spend three billion dollars to keep a productive citizen, an ordinary American citizen, under a continuous economic and psychological attack, without privacy, while the real enemies of America roam the streets freely).

“Despite some criticisms of how the right to privacy was created, and what exactly it protects, there is no question that such a right is now a Constitutional cornerstone of American law, and that it has become an important concept protecting individual civil liberties.”⁸

Freedom of the Press

The Supreme Court has sought to limit government intervention in the marketplace, holding that such restraint of expression violates the Constitution; that the government cannot restrain or prohibit expression based upon content which the government objects.

Tamarind Literary Works, the Petitioner’s literary business, writes and sells books. The government’s internet interference, internet blockage of **Tamarind Literary Works**, and intervention in the U.S. Postal Service to restrain its growth, constitutes a misuse of power by government officials, and should be sanctioned. This freedom of the press violation also removes from the Petitioner the ability to have a voice, as well as the economic means to sustain his own life (a conspiratorial element essential to the government’s involuntary servitude imprisonment, and medical experimentation).

“In a landmark case, *New York Times Co. v. United States*, 403 U.S. 713 (1971)-often referred to as the Pentagon Papers case- the U.S. Supreme Court turned back government attempts to censure printed materials in the New York Times.”⁹ The government’s maintenance of involuntary servitude upon the Petitioner constitutes a censure of **Tamarind Literary Works**, a censure which denies the Petitioner a voice amid the thirty-year imprisonment.

“The term “civil liberties” describes both those areas of life in which individuals have the right to be free from governmental interference, and the right of the people to be treated equally by their government.” 10

Accordingly, the Petitioner asks that the Supreme Court grant certiorari; to free the Petitioner from thirty-years of involuntary servitude imprisonment, from thirty-years of privacy violations, thirty-years of no right of peaceful assembly, of no equal protection of the law in state and local bus and rail transportation, and in interstate rail transportation; to free the Petitioner from government internet interference and U.S. Postal Service interference, and stalking. Actions which the government conspiratorially instituted to inflict medical harm and medical experimentation upon the Petitioner amid punitive environments, and to eliminate the Petitioner’s inherent right of privacy, and to restrain the business growth of **Tamarind Literary Works**.

The Petitioner is an innocent ordinary American citizen who thirty-years ago was also denied an administrative hearing in a grievance case at Walter Reed Army Medical Center.