

21-5171
No. _____

ORIGINAL

| |
|------------------------------|
| Supreme Court, U.S. FILED |
| JUL 13 2021 |
| OFFICE OF THE CLERK |

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

STEPHEN CUMMINGS -PETITIONER

VS.

JAMES CAMERON, LIGHTSTORM ENTERTAINMENT INC., SONY PICTURES INC.,
PARAMOUNT PICTURES CORP., PARAMOUNT HOME ENTERTAINMENT INC.,
TWENTIETH CENTURY FOX FILM CORP., DOLBY LABORATORIES INC.

-RESPONDENT(S)

ON A PETITION FOR AN (EXTRAORDINARY WRIT)

AND-OR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA,
AND-OR UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS, 9TH CIRCUIT CALIFORNIA

STEPHEN CUMMINGS

P O Box 373,

NEW YORK, NY, 10163

626-354-1834

| |
|--|
| RECEIVED |
| JUL 16 2021 |
| OFFICE OF THE CLERK SUPREME COURT, U.S. |

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. That, the lower court (and-or previous appeals court) have decided a legal matter in error, and in conflict with State and Federal Law.
2. That, (as “defendant”) in the most recent case (USDC Cent. Dist CA, 2:20-cv-04443), - I have in violation of my Constitutional Rights, and applicable State and Federal Law, Code, Procedure, - been denied the ability to call witnesses, take depositions, go to trial, or any other form of discovery. I am not even being allowed to SPEAK, in my own defense.
3. That, I have been illegally ordered to (pay some \$30,000 in legal fees to the respondents), and (have been ordered by the court to (remove valid filed UCC-1 liens, or other liens violations of my Constitutional, rights to freedom from illegal search and seizure, freedom from harassment (and by the government).
4. That, the court in all actions, has (through just error or bias), has denied me (the right to seek redress via the court, to right civil wrongs, and to be heard at all on valid claims), and thusly denied and violated itself, my rights under the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (25 U.S.C. § 1301-1304, U.S. Constitution and (Amendments 1-11), and all applicable State and Federal Law.
5. That, the (United States Court of Appeals), has previously (As per Rule 10 (a) “so far departed from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings, or has sanctioned such a departure by a lower court, as to call for an exercise of this Court’s supervisory power:”) and-or (As per Rule 10 (c), “has decided an important question of federal law that has not been, but should be, settled by this Court, or has decided an important federal

question in a way that conflicts with relevant decisions of this Court”).

6. That, judicial immunity and-or state or government sovereignty do not extend to the theft of personal property without just compensation. (Constitution of the U.S.A, 5th, Amendment).
7. That, in violation of my (Constitution of the U.S.A, 5th, Amendment rights) against self-recrimination, I have been compelled to give testimony against myself.
8. That, (As per Rule 11, “this case is of such imperative public importance as to justify deviation from normal appellate practice and to require immediate determination in this Court”), in accordance with 28 U.S.C. Sub.Ch. 2101(e). And that, (the USCA 9th Circ. CA., does not have the jurisdiction or authority to (deal with the problems that legally exist in these cases/deficiencies involved). And that, the Supreme Court of the United States’ Appellate and jurisdictional authority is both appropriate and not only warranted, but REQUIRED, at this point, -to right a legal wrong(s), and deficiencies legally, which exist in the underlying decisions/cases out of the USDC courts, or previously sanctioned by the appeals courts.
9. That, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Sub.Ch. (1651(a)), this writ is in aid of this Supreme Court of the United States’ appellate jurisdiction, and that exceptional circumstances warrant the exercise of this Court’s discretionary powers, and that adequate relief cannot be obtained in any other form, or from any other Court.
10. That, as per Rule 17, this Court’s original jurisdiction is invoked under Article III of the Constitution of the United States, 28 U.S.C. Sub.Ch. 1251 and U. S. Const., Amdt 11.
11. That, in violation of my Civil Rights, the court itself has attacked myself and my reputation fraudulently, whether through honest error or bias or other. In violation of my rights under Civil Rights Act of 1968 (25 U.S.C. § 1301-1304, U.S. Constitution's Bill of Rights (Amendments 1-11), and prejudicially to my case and my claims.

12. That the court has Deniad my right to appeal, and-or right of appeal of denial, in a timely

fashion, in violation of FRCP Rule 4, FRAP Rule 4, FRAP Rule 4(a)5.

13. Ultimately, I request that this Court, (1 - vacate/set aside all USDC Central Dist. Ca decisions/orders/judgments) whereby I withdraw action filed in Superior Court of the State of California, (2 - return these matters to the USDC Central Dist. FL, and order that the case goes forward), and (3 – Order that I be appointed counsel – as I have repeatedly motioned for same and have stated I am willing to pay said appointed counsel with a (1/3 contingent fee as is usual).

LIST OF PARTIES

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

RELATED CASES

- 1st Case, USDC (Orlando), 6 17-cv-00908

- 2nd Case, USDC (Orlando), 6 17-cv-01897

(USCA 11th circ. Atlanta# _____)

- 3rd Case, USDC (California). 2:20-cv-08044

(Originally filed in Superior Court State of California,
removed by motion to USDC (based on Copyright
causes of action),

- 4th Case, USDC (California), 2:20-cv-04443

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|---------|
| OPINIONS BELOW..... | 1 |
| JURISDICTION..... | 2 |
| CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED..... | 3 |
| STATEMENT OF THE CASE..... | 10 - 17 |
| REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT..... | 17 - 19 |
| CONCLUSION..... | 20 |

INDEX TO APPENDICES

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|----------------------------------|
| APPENDIX A | - | 1 st Case | USDC (Orlando), 6:17-cv-00908 |
| APPENDIX B | - | 2 nd Case | USDC (Orlando), 6:17-cv-01897 |
| APPENDIX C | - | 3 rd Case | USDC (California). 2:20-cv-08044 |
| APPENDIX D | - | 4th Case | USDC (California), 2:20-cv-04443 |
| APPENDIX E | - | Copy of UCC-1 Status printout Off. of Sec. of State, California | |
| APPENDIX F | - | Partial results of “Google search” | |
| | | (Key words: Stephen Cummings Titanic) | |
| APPENDIX G | - | Letter to USCA, 9 th Circuit, dated July 7, 2021, | |
| APPENDIX H | - | Letter to Attorney General of the United States, requesting declaration | |
| | | this petition/underlying action USDC Middle Dist. Florida (Orlando), is “of | |
| | | public importance”, is “in the public good”, are brought in good faith. | |
| APPENDIX I | - | Copy of this Court’s order(s) dated 3-19-2020, and 4-15-2020, regarding | |
| | | Covid-19, Copy of my own vaccination card, excerpts from article regarding | |
| | | allergic reaction from covid-19 vaccine. | |

TABLES AND AUTHORITIES CITED

| CASES | PAGE NUMBER |
|---|-------------|
| - <i>Bill Johnson's Restaurants, Inc. v. NLRB</i> , | 11 |
| - <i>BE&K Construction Co. v. National Labor Relations Board</i> | 11 |
| -(<i>Lochner v New York</i> , (1905)), | 11 |
| -“(<i>Bi-metallic Investment Co., v State Board of Eqqualization</i> (1915)) | 11 |
| STATUTES AND RULES | |
| - 28 U.S.C. Sub.Ch. (1651(a)), | |
| - Constitution of the U.S.A, and Amendment(s) 1-10 | 11 |
| - “Due process clause” of the 14 th Amendment to the Constitution | 11 |
| - Civil Rights Act of 1968 (25 U.S.C. § 1301-1304 | |
| - FRCP Rule 4, FRAP Rule 4, FRAP Rule 4(a)5 | 12 |
| - <u>Constitution of the U.S.A, 5th, Amendment</u> | 12 |
| - FRCP, USC, <u>Civil Rights Act of 1968 (25 U.S.C. § 1301-1304,</u> | 13,14,15 |
| <u>U.S. Constitution and (Amendments 1-11),</u> | |
| OTHER | |
| - Florida Statute Title XL, Chapter 713. | 12 |
| - Uniform Commercial Code, and U.S. Code | 12 |

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PETITION FOR AN (EXTRAORDINARY WRIT)
AND-OR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari and-or extraordinary writ issue to review the judgment (s) shown below.

OPINION BELOW

For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals 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 United States district court appears at Appendix A – D to the petition and is :

- reported at _____; or
 - has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or
 - is unpublished. (to the best knowledge of petitioner)

For cases from **state courts**:

No State Court has ruled on the merits. My action against the respondents in the Superior Court of the State of California, was REMOVED to the (USDC, Central Dist. CA,

Western Div.), via motion made by the defendants/respondents/((and in action of their own against myself) plaintiff's).

- 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 (USCA 9th circuit pending), USDC Decisions-orders-judgements July 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: _____, 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. _____.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. Sub.Ch. 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 denied by the United States Court of Appeals 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. SubCh 1257(a).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

- 28 U.S.C. Sub.Ch. (1651(a)), 28 U.S.C. SubCh 1257(a), 28 U.S.C. Sub.Ch. 1254(1).
- Constitution of the U.S.A, and Amendment(s) 1-10
- Civil Rights Act of 1968 (25 U.S.C. § 1301-1304)
- FRCP Rule 4, FRAP Rule 4, FRAP Rule 4(a)5
- “Due process clause” of the 14th Amendment to the Constitution

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Overview

1. This petition is brought to review (the decisions – orders -judgements) in (USDC Central Dist. California, USDC (2:20-cv-08044) and (2:20-cv-0443), AND (those prior determinations made in USDC Middle Dist. Florida (Orlando), 6:17-cv-01897, and Appeal of same in USCA 11th Circ. Atlanta, and prior USDC Middle Dist. Florida (Orlando), USDC (Orlando), 6:17-cv-00908.

2. These matters are currently pending in USCA 9th Circuit California as: Appeal Docket No. 21-55632, appeal of USDC (2:20-cv-08044) and Appeal Docket No. 21-55612, appeal of USDC (2:20-cv-0443). Note also: The 3rd Case, USDC Central Dist. California, USDC (2:20-cv-08044), - began in Superior Court of the State of California, and was removed by (motion of the defendants) to USDC, Central Dist. CA.

3. I hereby request that this Supreme Court of the United States, review all Docket sheet entries for all four USDC cases, -shown as the front of APPENDIX A – D, -and review HOW

these matters have been handled throughout.

Denial of due-process,

Denial of right to seek redress via the Court,

4. That, (as “defendant”) in the most recent case (USDC Cent. Dist CA, 2:20-cv-04443), - I have in violation of my Constitutional Rights, and applicable State and Federal Law, Code, Procedure, - been denied the ability to call witnesses, take depositions, go to trial, or any other form of discovery. This while the court SLANDERS / assault's me, with liable. See (APPENDIX D - Docket of(USDC (California), 2:20-cv-04443), -EVERY WORD I've said has been “stricken from the record”,I am not even being allowed to SPEAK, in my own defense. All in violation of Constitution of the U.S.A, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 14th Amendment, and specifically the “Due process clause” of the 14th Amendment to the Constitution.

I quote various articles to do with due process, and the right to seek redress via the court:

“In 1983, the Supreme Court’s opinion in *Bill Johnson’s Restaurants, Inc. v. NLRB* set out the principle that “the right of access to the courts is an aspect of the First Amendment right to petition the Government for redress of grievances.” In a June 2002 decision, *BE&K Construction Co. v. National Labor Relations Board*, the high court, though not ruling on First Amendment grounds, nevertheless noted that it had long viewed the right to sue in court as a form of petition. “We have recognized this right to petition as one of the most precious of the liberties safeguarded by the Bill of Rights,” Justice Sandra Day O’Connor wrote for the Court, “and have explained that the right is implied by the very idea of a government, republican in form.””.

And,

“(Constitution of the U.S.A, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 14th Amendment, (4th Amendment, (protections against unreasonable search and seizure)), (5th Amendment, requires that “due process of law” be part of any proceeding that denies a citizen “life, liberty or property” and requires the government to compensate citizens when it takes private property for public use. “Amendment V No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand

jury, nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.”.”,

And

Cornell Law School : (*Lochner v New York*, (1905)), “Supreme Court found unconstitutional, a New York law regulating the working hours of bakers, ruling that the public benefit of the law was not enough to justify the substantive right of the bakers to work under their own terms.”

And

Cornell Law School: “(*Bi-metallic Investment Co., v State Board of Equalization* (1915)), the Supreme Court held that only politics (the citizen’s “power, immediate or remote, over those who make the rule”) controlled the State’s action setting the level of taxes but if the dispute was about a taxpayer’s individual liability, not a general question, the taxpayer had a right to some kind of hearing (“the right to support his allegations by arguments however brief and , if need be, by proof however informal”). This left the State a lot of room to say what procedures it would provide, but it did not permit it to deny them altogether.””

Required to give testimony against myself

5. That, in violation of my (Constitution of the U.S.A, 5th Amendment rights) against self-recrimination, I have been compelled to give testimony against myself, -due SOLELY to the fraudulent activities of the respondents – this - (13 years after the fact of the original creation and release of the film), and based on those fraudulent assertions, -errant decisions by the court.

Denial of right to appeal, and/or right of appeal of denial

6. That I have been denied the right to appeal and or right to appeal denial of right to appeal, in violation of FRCP Rule 4, FRAP Rule 4, FRAP Rule 4(a)5, See Appendix B, C, and D.

Dockets and decisions.

Illegal imposition of debt,

Illegal denial of State and Federal Law / UCC

7. That, as of the date of this document, I have been illegally ordered to (pay some \$30,000 in legal fees to the respondents), and (have been ordered by the court to (remove valid filed UCC-1 liens, or other liens that neither myself, nor the State of California, nor the State of Florida, have yet seen fit to deny / withdraw /remove). My UCC-1 Liens are in compliance with Uniform Commercial Code, -my Mechanic Lien /other are in compliance with Florida Statute Title XL, Chapter 713. Mechanic's/other Lien law). - Constituting violations of my Constitutional, rights to freedom from illegal search and seizure, freedom from harassment (and by the government).

Fraud / theft / harassment under color of law, Judicial error or bias, vexatious litigants, Theft of private property without just compensation in violation of Constitutional, State and Federal law, slander and defamation of my character and claims

8. That, the court in all actions, has (through just error or bias), has denied me (the right to seek redress via the court, to right civil wrongs, and to be heard at all on valid claims), and thusly denied and violated itself, my rights under the Constitution of the U.S.A, and all Amendment(s), and all applicable State and Federal Law. I have NEVER been allowed in any action, to call witnesses, supply evidence, take depositions, proceed to trial, or any other form of discovery, in violation of FRCP, USC, Civil Rights Act of 1968 (25 U.S.C. § 1301-1304, U.S. Constitution and (Amendments 1-11), and all applicable State and Federal Law.

9. That, judicial immunity and-or state or government sovereignty do not extend to the theft of

personal property without just compensation. (Constitution of the U.S.A, 5th, Amendment).

10. That, in violation of my Civil Rights, the court itself has attacked myself and my reputation fraudulently, whether through honest error or bias or other. In violation of my rights under Civil Rights Act of 1968 (25 U.S.C. § 1301-1304, U.S. Constitution's Bill of Rights (Amendments 1-11), and prejudicially to my case and my claims. That the lower USDC courts have ruled IN ERROR, due to, largely the fraudulent assertions put forth by the adverse parties, - and that the lower courts have IN ERROR relied ON, those fraudulent defenses and assertions in making mistaken determinations, and-or themselves making, false assertions within their decisions.

11. That, the errors in the lower court decisions are due largely/possibly totally, to fraudulent defenses and fraudulent assertions (put forth in all pleadings/all actions) by the respondents. And that, - the respondents have in fact, defrauded the / all Court's involved, this plaintiff, the general public. They have have put forth fraudulent defenses and assertions, have and have attempted to commit fraud under the color of law. They are VEXATIOUS litigants, as per ((Central District Local Rule 83-8.1, 8.4) and (Cal. Code Civ. P., SubCh 391.391.8 (vexatious litigants statute)).

12. That, within ALL same underlying actions / court(s) the respondents have, and have attempted to, - use the court(s) themselves as a device for violations by the respondents of (California Penal Code 484 (theft) and (fraud)), (California Penal Code 240, and CACI 1301, (assault by liable)), (California Penal Code 646.9(a), 422(a) – (harassment)), (California Civil Code Sect. 44, 45, 46 – (Defamation (liable and slander))), and (New York Penal Code, S 190.65 Scheme to defraud in the first degree), and (Florida Statutes, Title XLVI, Ch. 812, and (812.014, Theft, -

“812.014). That in fact, in EVERY SINGLE PLEADING of the respondents, in EVERY ACTION, in ALL courts thus far, the respondents have (Assaulted me with liable -with seemingly impunity from the court), with words like “dillusional”, “frivolous”, etc. . This despite their legal obligation -to bring forth any relevant information in their possession regarding these matters.

13. That, in violation of my Civil Rights, the court itself has attacked myself and my reputation fraudulently, whether through honest error or bias or other. With words like “frivolous” In violation of my rights under Civil Rights Act of 1968 (25 U.S.C. § 1301-1304, U.S. Constitution's Bill of Rights (Amendments 1-11). And has acted in a way extremely prejudicial to myself, my case, and my (valid claims as per state and federal law).

14. That, the Court, (due primarily to the fraudulent defenses and assertions made by the respondents, have relied on those fraudulent assertions, and have thus ruled in error), denying my right to due process under the law. In violation of my rights under Civil Rights Act of 1968 (25 U.S.C. § 1301-1304, U.S. Constitution's Bill of Rights (Amendments 1-11).

15. That, the combined effect of the (respondents fraudulent activities / the reliance on the court(s) thus far on those fraudulent activities and assertions / judgments-orders-decisions made in error by the court) have the combined legal effect of (theft of property by the government anyone else) without compensation, in violation of my rights under the (Constitution of the U.S.A, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, Amendment(s)). And that theft and fraud thus far is being carried out seemingly willing, by the court system, and in violation of my right to not have my property taken without just compensation. Constitution of the U.S.A, 5th, Amendment. Would (Menendez have made decision(s) he did, if the defendants had not lied?.

16.(Please understand,I don't approach the court “begging for mercy” as a pro-se

plaintiff. I approach this Court saying:"I'M BEING DEFRAUDEDHELP!!!! !!!!....somebody call a cop!!!""". Whether by (fraud from the respondents) and-or (non-iniquitous judicial error) and-or by (judicial bias),"IM BEING DEFRAUDED,YOU are being defrauded....we are ALL being defrauded ").

17. There is another matter regarding copyright which is not even being addressed. I here inform the court of an interesting "tid-bit" if you will from the world of film-making. I just learned something/stumbled across it looking for something else, recently, -and I was not aware of this particular situation, -I imagine that you Justices are not either, -not exactly something either of us deal with regularly, -that is this:

.....when a film is made, the Director-Studios, share the copyright for the CHARACTER created in the film, WITH THE actor. I did not know that. The only problem with that HERE, -is that (DiCaprio) PLAYED A ROLE, he played an EXISTING PERSON, -he played ME. Solegally/contractually, Jim/the studios CANNOT contract with (DiCaprio) to give him MY OWN personal copyright property of -myself – an existing person. Do you see?....its possible Jim/other made some sort of deal they were legally entitled to make. My situation is in a lot of ways like ("The Audey Murphy story". I don't know HOW , -that situation was handled legally, but I may offer a supplemental brief on that / other in future.

Practicality -authority of this Court's intervention or authorities at this time

18. That, the (United States Court of Appeals(USCA 11th Circ. Atlanta)/other), has previously (As per Rule 10 (a) "so far departed from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings, or has sanctioned such a departure by a lower court, as to call for an exercise of this Court's supervisory power:") and-or (As per Rule 10.(c), "has decided an important

question of federal law that has not been, but should be, settled by this Court, or has decided an important federal question in a way that conflicts with relevant decisions of this Court"). And that, (As per Rule 11, "this case is of such imperative public importance as to justify deviation from normal appellate practice and to require immediate determination in this Court"), in accordance with 28 U.S.C. Sub.Ch. 2101(e).

19. That, (the USCA 9th Circ. CA., does not have the jurisdiction or authority to (deal with the problems that legally exist in these cases/deficiencies involved), that, legal deficiencies exist within (both the decisions made at the lower USDC Cent. Dist. CA., court level, both in these underlying cases and in other related cases). Appeal of (Wright decisions) in the USCA 9th Circ., does not solve the issue of (mistaken or errored judgments made based on fraudulent defenses or fraudulent assertions of the Respondents. Warranting exercise of this Court's discretionary and-or appellate authority.

20. This petitioners actions thus far, have (never actually,totally and completely.....properly) dismissed except WITHOUT prejudice. (I never served the Summons' in (2nd Orlando action)), and I never paid the fee for the Appeal in (Atlanta USCA). The only total and complete, case, which has been actually carried thought properly beginning to end, was the (1st Orlando case). What hope would I have had of (review/writ of certiorari) coming out of the USDC in Orlando, -when (Atlanta USCA) denied my appeal – even though there never was a valid appeal – I never paid the fee.

21. That, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Sub.Ch. (1651(a)), this writ is in aid of this Supreme Court of the United States' appellate jurisdiction, and that exceptional circumstances warrant the exercise of this Court's discretionary powers, and that adequate relief cannot be obtained in any other form, or from any other Court.

Request for Relief

22. I request that this Court, (1 - vacate/set aside all USDC Central Dist. Ca decisions/orders/judgments) whereby I withdraw action filed in Superior Court of the State of California, (2 - return these matters to the USDC Central Dist. FL, and order that the case goes forward), and (3 – Order that I be appointed counsel – from the pool of pro-bono attorneys available to the court, -as I have repeatedly in all actions motioned for same and have stated I am willing to pay said appointed counsel with a (1/3 contingent fee as is usual), and the respondents are taking advantage illegally of the fact that I am not represented.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

23. That, the (U.S. Court of Appeals), has previously (As per Rule 10 (a) “so far departed from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings, or has sanctioned such a departure by a lower court, as to call for an exercise of this Court’s supervisory power:”) and-or (As per Rule 10 (c), “has decided an important question of federal law that has not been, but should be, settled by this Court, or has decided an important federal question in a way that conflicts with relevant decisions of this Court”

24. That, as per Rule 17, this Court’s original jurisdiction is invoked under Article III of the Constitution of the United States, 28 U.S.C. Sub.Ch. 1251 and U. S. Const., Amdt 11.

25. That, (As per Rule 11, “this case is of such imperative public importance as to justify deviation from normal appellate practice and to require immediate determination in this Court”), in accordance with 28 U.S.C. Sub.Ch. 2101(e).

26. That, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Sub.Ch. (1651(a)), this writ is in aid of this Supreme Court of

the United States' appellate jurisdiction, and that exceptional circumstances warrant the exercise of this Court's discretionary powers, and that adequate relief cannot be obtained in any other form, or from any other Court.

27. Truly, - VERY RESPECTFULLY, - There's 3 of you right now on THIS COURT, who know of me and are aware that I have an association to the film 'Titanic', I'd say that number is probably a lot higher. Yet THIS is what I'm having to listen to out of your USDC Judge's :

Hon Otis Wright..... "does not comply with local rules",

Hon Menendez....."fails to state claim upon which relief can be based"the "junkyard"....."KITCHEN SINK" excuse for USDC Judge's when they want to SHINE YOU ON and write you off without exactly saying why....again, respectfully to all, - but I've been in your Court's before..... (i.e.they NEVER say just exactly HOW it is not in compliance)..... Perhaps then you Honorable Justices of THIS Supreme Court of the United States will tell me:

How is it that MY complaints, are not in compliance,when my actions are VERBATIM based on (Wepner v Stallone, (Superior Court State of New Jersey), and (USDC, DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY, Civil Action No. 03-6166)), and (Sandmann v The Washington Post, (Eastern District of Kentucky , 2:2019cv00019, USDC)),ALL of which, travelled through the court systems successfully without ever being called, "does not comply with local rules", "frivolous", "fails to state claim upon which relief can be based" , "SHOTGUN pleading".

28. Again, NO DISRESPECT to anybody.....BUT.....James Cameron's next highest grossing film ('Avatar' 2010) in adjusted dollars, grossed (approx.. 44%) of 'Titanic'. Leo DiCaprio's next highest grossing film ('Inception' 2010) in adjusted dollars, grossed (approx..

35%) of ‘Titanic’. Kate Winslet,well,let’s just say, she was (literally flipping burgers in “Liverpool” ...“AYE!”)-:),prior to ‘Titanic”..... If you’ll allow me this slight Bon Mot,to say (that my involvement, my words, my ideas, my likeness, my life-story, my family history, my stories of Dr Ballard,etc., etc., etc.), -had no significant effect, is insulting EMBARRASSING, RUDE, legally in error, slanderous and defamatory.

29. One of your own Justices (Hon. Chief Justice Renquist), RIP, said : (as much as I can verbatim quote him/the ideal he expressed, that.....”He believed that the Court should reflect the will of the people, in as much as it was possible to do so”.....

”The normal repeat viewing rate for a blockbuster theatrical film is about 5%.

The repeat rate for *Titanic* was over 20%.”

”At one point, Paramount had to send out new prints of the movie because theaters had literally worn out their reels”.

”*Titanic* spent more time at #1 than most movies play in theaters”.

“ ‘TITANIC’ STAYED NUMBER ONE AT THE BOX OFFICE FOR 15 WEEKS,
A RECORD WHICH STILL STANDS TODAY”.

If you do a “Google search” right now.....(most successful film in history),Answer:

‘TITANIC’

.....’Jack Dawson’, and the entire film originated with me.

I’d say “the People” have already spoken. It only remains for the Court, to get in-sync with its own country and people. ‘Titanic” was release in 1997, I was 31 years old. I’m 56 years old. I’d say I’ve waited long enough to be PAID by these “game playing” respondents.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen Rasmussen

Date: 7-9-2021

Shyam D. Buxani

Notary Public, State of New York
Registration No. 01BU6144080
Qualified in New York County
Commission Expires April 24, 2022