

21-5212

ORIGINAL

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

Supreme Court, U.S.  
FILED

MAY 21 2021

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

TIMOTHY OLAUGHAN PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

vs.  
THE BOEING COMPANY — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS 8TH CIRCUIT  
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

TIMOTHY OLAUGHAN  
(Your Name)

FMC PMS 4000  
(Address)

ROCHESTER MINNESOTA 55903  
(City, State, Zip Code)

501. 281. 0614  
(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

DID THE DEFENDANTS HAVE AUTHORIZATION TO SUSPEND EMPLOYMENT WITHOUT CAUSE(S) TO COERCE THE PETITIONER TO RESIGN UNDER DURESS BY FAILING TO ARBITRATE?

WAS THERE ANY ABNORMAL OR BIZARRE OF THE PETITIONER TO WARRANT JOB SUSPENSION IN AUGUST 2000 BY THE DEFENDANT(S)?

DID THE PETITIONER'S EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION CIVIL ACTION LITIGATION LEAD TO HIS ILLEGAL CIVIL COMMITMENT IN THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI IN AN ATTEMPT TO SILENCE HIM ON BEHALF OF THE BOEING COMPANY (DEFENDANTS)?

## 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:

DANIEL J. SEHELL  
BOB MEDARIELS  
THE BOEING COMPANY PO BOX 516 SLCMO 63166

## RELATED CASES

WILLHOUSE V SUMMER CO. BOARD OF EDU. 569 F.3d 562 (6th Cir. 2009)  
THOMPSON V DAVIS 269 F.3d 890, 898 n.4 (9th Cir. )  
WHITKE V ORINGER 442 F.Supp. 2d 236 (E.D. Pa. 2006 )  
K.M. V ALA DEPT. OF YOUTH SERV. 360 F.Supp. 2d 1253 (M.D. ALA. 2005 )  
FAAS V WA CNTY. 260 F.Supp. 2d 198 (D. ME. 2003 )  
HAMMOND V GORDON CNTY. 316 F.Supp. 2d 1262 (M.D. CA. 2002 )  
HEARD V SHARPHAM 253 F.3d 316 (7th Cir. 2001 )  
SHOMO V CITY OF N.Y. 519 F.3d 176 (2nd Cir. 2009 )  
KEMSLEY V CITY OF COLUMBUS 551 F.3d 693 (6th Cir. 2009 )

## 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

*SEE ATTACHMENT*

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

### CASES

### PAGE NUMBER

WILHOUSE V SUMNER CO. Bd OF EDU.	569 F.3d 562 (6th Cir. 2009)
THOMPSON V DAVIS	245 F.3d 890, 898 N.Y. (9th Cir. )
WHITE V ORINGER	442 F.Supp. 2d 236 (E.D. PA. 2006)
K.M. V ALA DEPT. OF YOUTH SERV.	360 F.Supp. 2d 1253 (M.D. ALA. 2005)
FARS V WA CNTY.	260 F.Supp. 2d 198 (D.ME. 2003)
HAMMOND V GORDON CNTY.	316 F.Supp. 2d 1262 (M.D. CA. 2002)
HEARD V SHEARHAN	253 F.3d 316 (11th Cir. 2001)
SHOWN V CITY OF N.Y.	519 F.3d 176 (2nd Cir. 2009)
KEMSLEY V CITY OF COLUMBUS	551 F.3d 693 (6th Cir. 2009)

### STATUTES AND RULES

8 USCS §§ 802, 806, 9 USCS § 4, § 922(b), § 929(A), § 1848, § 1852  
 18 USCS § 1391, § 1514 (A), 28 USCS § 1343, § 1346, 42 USCS § 1997 (d)  
 42 USCS § 1981-82, § 1985-1986, § 12101 § 12102  
 RULE 12, 54, 55, 56, 51, 58, 60 FED R CIV P  
 RULE 25, 21, 32, 35, 40, 41(A) FRAP

### OTHER

PLRA, ADA, REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973, EEOC,  
 MD. COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS, CIVIL RIGHTS ACT 1871 § 1964  
 CARES ACT OF 2020, CORP. ACCOUNTABILITY ACT 2002,  
 28 USCS CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS, LABOR RELATIONS MANAGEMENT

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 \_\_\_\_\_ 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 \_\_\_\_\_ 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 5/10/2021.

☐ 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: 5/10/2021, 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. § 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**

1ST, 4TH, 5TH, 6TH, 8TH, 14TH CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS.

PLRA, ADA, REHAB ACT OF 1973, EEOC, MCHR,

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1871 & 1964

CARES ACT OF 2020

CORPORATE ACCOUNTABILITY ACT 2002

28 CODES OF FEDERAL REGULATION

LABOR RELATIONS MANAGEMENT BOARD

MISSOURI COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS



## CONTENT

1. Federal Question(s)	
2. Constitutional Amendments Cited	
3. Cases Cited	
4. Petition for a Writ of Certiorari	
5. Nature of Petition	
6. Jurisdictional Statement	Page 1
7. Statement of Petition	Page 2
8. Statement of Facts	Page 3
9. Standard of Review	Page 4
10. Relief Sought	Page 5
11. Conclusion	Page 6
12. Conclusion of Titles and Acts	Page 7
13. Exhibit A (Eighth Circuit Rehearing Judgment)	Page 9
14. Exhibit B (District Court Judgment)	Page 10
15. Exhibit C (Original Complaint)	Page 11
16. Exhibit D (Amended Rehearing Petition)	Page 12
17. Exhibit E (Administrative Remedies Exhaustion)	Page 13
18. Exhibit F (Arbitration Case Requirement)	Page 14
19. Exhibit G (Arbitration Case Requirement)	Page 15
20. Exhibit H (Retaliatory Actions against Petitioner)	Page 16

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS CITED

1. First Constitutional Amendment
2. Fourth Constitutional Amendment
3. Fifth Constitutional Amendment
4. Sixth Constitutional Amendment
5. Eighth Constitutional Amendment
6. Fourteenth Constitutional Amendment

TITLE(S) CITED

1. Title 8 U.S.C. Section 802
2. Title 8 U.S.C. Section 806
3. Title 9 U.S.C. Section 4
4. Title 9 U.S.C. Section 922(b)
5. Title 9 U.S.C. Section 929(A)
6. Title 9 U.S.C. Section 1848
7. Title 9 U.S.C. Section 1852
8. Title 18 U.S.C. Section 1514(A)
9. Title 18 U.S.C. Section 1391
10. Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1343
11. Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1346
12. Title 42 U.S.C. Section 1997(d)
13. Title 42 U.S.C. Section 1981-82
14. Title 42 U.S.C. Section 1985-1986
15. Title 42 U.S.C. Section 12101 & 12102

STATUTORY PROVISION(S)

1. Prisoner's Litigation Reform Act
2. Americans with Disabilities Act
3. Rehabilitation Act of 1973
4. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
5. Missouri Commission of Human Rights
6. Civil Rights Act of 1871 and 1964
7. Cares Act of 2020
8. Corporation Accountability Act 2002
9. 28 Codes of Federal Regulation
10. Labor Relations Management Board

PETITION(S) FILED

1. Petition for Employment Discrimination
2. Notice of Appeal
3. Petition for Rehearing Rule 35 En Banc of the FRAP
4. Petition for Rehearing Rule 40 of the FRAP

CASE(S) CITED

- |  |                                    |
|--|------------------------------------|
| 1. Milhouse v Summer Co. Board of Edu. | 569 F.3d 562(6th Cir. 2009)        |
| 2. Thompson v Davis                    | 295 F.3d 890, 898 n.4 (9th Cir.)   |
| 3. White v Oringer                     | 442 F.Supp. 2d 236 (E.D. Pa.2006)  |
| 4. K.M. v Ala Dept. of Youth Serv.     | 360 F.Supp. 2d 1253(M.D. ALA. 200) |
| 5. FAAS v Wa CMTY.                     | 260 F.Supp. 2d 198 (D.Me. 2003)    |
| 6. Hammond v Gordon Cnty,              | 316 F. Supp. 2d 1262 (M.D. Ca. 20) |
| 7. Heard v Shearhan                    | 253 F.3d 316 (7th Cir. 2001)       |
| 8. Shomo v City of N.Y.                | 579 F. 3d 176 (2nd Cir. 2009)      |
| 9. Hemsley v City of Columbus          | 557 F.3d 693 (6th Cir. 2009)       |

JUDICIAL COMPLAINT(S)

- |                        |                                 |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. JCP No. 08-21-90005 | O'Laughlin v The Boeing Company |
| 2. JCP No. 08-21-90007 | O'Laughlin v The Boeing Company |
| 3. JCP No. 08-21-90009 | O'Laughlin v The Boeing Company |
| 4. JCP No. 08-21-90012 | O'Laughlin v The Boeing Company |
| 5. JCP No. 08-21-90015 | O'Laughlin v The Boeing Company |

RULE(S) CITED

1. Rule 12 of the FRCivP
2. Rule 54 of the FRCivP
3. Rule 55 of the FRCivP
4. Rule 56 of the FRCivP
5. Rule 57 of the FRCivP
6. Rule 58 of the FRCivp
7. Rule 60 of the FRCivp
8. Rule 25 of the FRAP
9. Rule 27 of the FRAP
10. Rule 32 of the FRAP
11. Rule 35 of the FRAP
12. Rule 40 of the FRAP
13. Rule 47(A) of the FRAP

IN THE  
UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

---

OCTOBER TERM, 2021

---

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
FROM THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS  
TO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

NAME OF PETITIONER:

TIMOTHY P. O'LAUGHLIN

ADDRESS OF PETITIONER:

REG. NO. #27778-044 1-1

NAME OF DEFENDANT(S):

DANIEL J. SCHELL  
BOB MCDANIELS  
THE BOEING COMPANY

ADDRESS OF DEFENDANT(S):

POST OFFICE BOX 516  
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI 63166

RELIEF SOUGHT:

PETITIONER SEEKS THAT THE  
UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT  
AWARD A FINANCIAL COMPENSATORY  
DAMAGE SUM OF TEN MILLION DOLLARS  
(10,000,000.00) AND DOUBLE THIS  
AMOUNT IN PUNITIVE DAMAGES FOR HIS  
PSYCHICATRIC, PSYCHOLOGICAL DEPRESSION  
AND EMOTIONAL DISTRESS SUFFERED AND  
HIS ILLEGAL CIVIL COMMITMENT AND THE  
WRONGFUL IMPRISONMENT IN AN ATTEMPT  
TO SILENCE HIM BY THE UNITED STATES  
ATTORNEY AND THE ILLEGAL FORCED MED-  
ICATION OF DANGEROUS AND HARMFUL PSYCHO-  
TROPIC DRUGS AGAINST HIS WILL IN WHICH  
THE PETITIONER RESERVED LIBERTY INTER-  
EST TO BE FREE FROM UNWANTED BODY IN-  
TRUSIONS

PETITIONER SEEKS:

AN EN BANC COURT OPINION

NATURE OF PETITION

ALLEGATIONS(S) OF BEHAVIORAL MISCONDUCT  
AND WRONGFUL JOB SUSPENSION AND THE FAILURE  
TO ARBITRATE THAT LEAD TO A WRONGFUL CIVIL  
COMMITMENT AND WRONGFUL IMPRISONMENT IN WHICH  
PETITIONER SUFFERED FROM AN ILLEGAL FORCED MEDICATION  
OF DANGEROUS AND HARMFUL PSYCHO-TROPIC DRUGS VIOLATED  
HIS CIVIL AND CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RIGHTS TO BE FREE  
UNWANTED AND UNJUSTIFIED BODY INTRUSIONS.

IN THE  
UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

OCTOBER TERM, 2021

Timothy P. O'Laughlin,  
PETITIONER

-v-

Mr. Daniel J. Schell, Director/  
Mr. Bob McDaniels, General Foreman?  
The Boeing Company,  
DEFENDANT(S)

)  
(  
)  
(  
)  
(  
)  
(  
)

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
FROM THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS  
TO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

HONORABLE COURT,

JURISDICTION

COMES NOW, petitioner hereinafter "O'Laughlin" in  
pro se with PETITION for a WRIT of CERTIORARI from the  
Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals to the United States Supreme  
Court, in which, he is a CIVILLY COMMITTED DETAINEE whom is  
NOT REQUIRED to PREPAY COURT COST or FEES alleging EMPLOYMENT  
DISCRIMINATION by UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTIONS of the defendant(s).

Petitioner, claims that his CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RIGHTS were VIOLATED by the INFRINGEMENT and the ABRIDING actions of the defendants, whom, failed and/or neglected to ARBITRATE his UNJUSTIFIED SUSPENSION from EMPLOYMENT with the defendant(s) in 2000, in which, the petitioner was coerced into RESIGNING his position of employment pursuant to Rule 12 of the United States Supreme Court Rules, whereof, jurisdiction and adjudication is invoked upon the United States Supreme Court.

STATEMENT OF PETITION

O'Laughlin, comes now, with contention(s) in Statement of Petition for a Writ of Certiorari that alleges defendant(s) with EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION, in which, thereafter O'Laughlin was coerced into resigning his position under DURESS defendant(s) INITIATED RETALIATORY MEASURES and ACTIONS against him by FALSELY ACCUSING him of SUFFERING from a PERCEIVED MENTAL ILLNESS that EVENTUALLY RESULTED in his being WRONGFULLY CIVILLY COMMITTED as a MENTAL PATIENT in the Bureau of Prisons by UNJUSTIFIED and UNWARRANTED PROCEDURES and PROCESSES of the United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Missouri, whom, sought to Silence O'Laughlin on behalf of the defendant(s).

O'Laughlin's, contention(s) in Statement of Writ of Certiorari that the defendant(s) SOUGHT ASSISTANCE from the United States Attorney to Silence him or PLACE a STUMBLING BLOCK before him of his EMPLOYMENT DISCIMINATION LITIGATION against the defendant(s) by his or her MALICIOUS PROSECUTION alleging the petitioner of suffering of a MENTAL DISEASE and DEFECT that rendered him as being a SUBSTANTIAL RISK to SOCIETY and PROPERTY of OTHERS without, in which, there was no EVIDENCE, MATERIAL FACTS, INCIDENCES nor CIRCUMSTANCES which wuld had been JUSTIFICATION or would had WARRANTED a CIVIL COMMITMENT and an CIVIL IMPRISONMENT, where, during his Wrongful Civil Commitment and Wrongfu Imprisonment OI'Laughlin was and is ILLEGALLY FORCED MEDICATED a DANGEROUS and HARMFUL PSYCHO-TROPIC DRUG against his will in which he RESERVED LIBERTY INTEREST to had been free from ILLEGAL and UNJUSTIFIED and UNWANTED BODY INTRUSIONS, whereby, the there were not Court Orders to Force Medicate him.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

O'Laughlin, contend in Statement of Facts in Petition for a Writ of Certiorari that the defendant(s) EMPLOYED the ASSISTANCE of the United States Attorney to ATTEMPT by wrongfully ACCUSING him of OFFENSES that gave CAUSE to WRONGFULLY CIVILLY COMMIT and WRONGFULLY IMPRISON him as a MENTAL PATIENT, in which , prior to his Civil Litigation:agains the defendant(s) there were never allegations or questions of his MENTAL STABILITY.



O'Laughlin's, Statement of Facts contend that he was NEVER CONSIDERED nor DIAGNOSED as being MENTALLY IMPAIRED prior to his WRONGFUL CIVIL COMMITMENT and WRONGFUL IMPRISONMENT, whereof, such ADVERSE and VIOLATIVE ACTIONS were INITIATED and ENFORCED upon him the United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Missouri, whom, SOUGHT to DISCREDIT, DISHONOR and to BRING CONTEMPT upon O'Laughlin in an ATTEMPT to UNDERMINE the MERIT and LEGITIMATECY of his EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION CIVIL LITIGATION against the defendant(s).

O'Laughlin, contend in Statement of Facts in Petition for a Writ of Certiorari that the defendant(s) EMPLOYED the ASSISTANCE of the United States Attorney to Silence him or PERSUADE him by a WRONGFUL CIVIL COMMITMENT and a WRONGFUL IMPRISONMENT with an ILLEGALLY UNJUSTIFIED FORCED MEDICATING of a DANGEROUS and HARMFUL PSYCHO-TROPIC DRUG after FALSLEY LABELING him as a MENTAL PATIENT that was GRAVELY ILL, whom, was also a SUBSTANTIAL RISK to SOCIETY, VIOLENT and DANGEROUS and a THREAT to persons and proeperty of others.

#### STANDARD OF REVIEW

O'Laughlin, comes now, in Standard of Review as to how Petition for a Writ of Certiorari should be review is that 1)

the defendant(s) FAILED and/or NEGLECTED to ARBITRATE his UNJUSTIFIED SUSPENSION from EMPLOYMENT in 2000 (2) the defendant(s) SOUGHT and EMPLOYED the ASSISTANCE of the United States Attorney in an ATTEMPT to DISCREDIT, DISHONOR and BRING CONTEMPT upon him as SUFFERING from a MENTAL DISEASE and DEFECT, where, he was SUBJECTED to a WRONGFUL CIVIL COMMITMENT and a WRONGFUL IMPRISONMENT (3) O'Laughlin was NEVER considered to had been DISABLED, in which, he was NOT REQUIRED to EXHAUST ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES with the AMERICANS with DISABILITIES ACT PROVISIONS (4) O'Laughlin did EXHAUST his REMEDIES with the EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION in 2001 and the MISSOURI HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION in 2001, in which, he RECEIVED the NOTICE of his RIGHT to SUE (5) O'Laughlin, was also ILLEGALLY and UNJUSTIFIABLY FORCED MEDICATED FOUND to had been DANGEROUS and HARMFUL PSYCHO-TROPIC DRUGS against his will (6) O'Laughlin, RESERVED LIBERTY INTEREST to had been FREE from UNWANTED BODY INTRUSIONS of being FORCED MEDICATED (7) there were NO PRIOR DIAGNOSIS, EVIDENCES, INCIDENCES. nor CIRCUMSTANCES of O'Laughlin suffering form a MENTAL IMPAIRMENT, DISEASE nor DEFECT until thereafter his filing of the EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION CLAIM against the defendant(s).

RELIEF SOUGHT

O'Laughlin, seeks in Relief Sought that the United States Supreme Court do GRANT and/or APPROVE his PETITION for a WRIT of CERTIORARI with AWARDANCE of a Financial Compensatory AWARD

at the sum of ten million dollars (10,000,000.00) and double this amount in punitive damages for the psychiatric, psychological depression and emotional distress and with the VACATING and/or the SETTING ASIDE of the WRONGFUL CIVIL COMMITMENT under 4246(d) due to the LACK of MATERIAL FACTS, EVIDENCE, INCIDENCES, CIRCUMSTANCES nor any PARTICULARS of VIOLENCE nor MENTAL INSTABILITY PRIOR to his filing of the EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION CIVIL ACTION LITIGATION against the defendant(s), in which, he was SUBJECTED to RETALIATORY ACTIONS by the United States Attorney, whom, SOUGHT to SILENCE him on BEHALF of the defendant(s) by a WRONGFUL IMPRISONMENT and FALSE ACCUSATIONS of a MENTAL DISEASE and DEFECT.

#### CONCLUSION

ACCORDINGLY and UNPRECEDENTED O'Laughlin pray that his PETITION for a WRIT of CERTIORARI do be GRANTED and/or APPROVED alleging EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION, a WRONGFUL CIVIL COMMITMENT, a WRONGFUL IMPRISONMENT and an ILLEGAL FORCED MEDICATING him a FOUND to had been a DANGEROUS and a HARMFUL PSYCHO-TROPIC DRUG, which, was an ATTEMPT by the defendant(s), whom, EMPLOYED the ASSISTANCE of the United States Attorney to DISCREDIT, DISHONOR and BRING CONTEMPT upon him by LABELING and FALSELY DIAGNOSING him as suffering from a MENTAL DISEASE and DEFECT that rendered him as a SUBSTANTIAL RISK to SOCIETY and PROPERTY of others that required him to be PLACED in a MENTAL FACILITY as a matter of CIVIL and CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RIGHTS in accordance to the DUE PROCESS of the LAW CLAUSES of the First, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Eighth and Fourteenth Constitutional Amendments

and Title(s) 42 U.S.C. Section 12101 and 12102, 42 U.S.C.  
Section 1981-1982 and 1997(A), the Americans with Disabilities  
Act, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Cares Act of 2020  
and Rule 12 of the United States Supreme Court Rules now before  
the United States Supreme Court for deliberation and review.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

Timothy P. O'Laughlin/PETITIONER  
Reg..No. #27778-044 1-1  
Post Office Box 4000  
Federal Medical Center  
Rochester, Minnesota 55903

Dated:

FEDERAL QUESTION(S)

DID THE DEFENDANT'S HAVE AUTHORIZATION  
TO SUSPEND EMPLOYMENT WITHOUT CAUSE(S)  
TO COERCE THE PETITIONER TO RESIGN  
UNDER DURESS BY FAILING TO ARBRITRATE?

WAS THERE ANY ABNORMAL OR BIZARRE  
OF THE PETITIONER TO WARRANT JOB  
SUSPENSION IN AUGUST 2000 BY THE DEFENDANT(S)?

DID THE PETITIONER'S EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION  
CIVIL ACTION LITIGATION LEAD TO HIS ILLEGAL  
CIVIL COMMITMENT IN THE WESTERN DISTRICT  
OF MISSOURI IN AN ATTEMPT BY THE UNITED  
STATES ATTORNEY TO SILENCE HIM ON BEHALF OF  
THE BOEING COMPANY(DEFENDANTS)?

WAS O'LAUGHLIN REQUIRED TO EXHAUST ADMINISTRATIVE  
AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES REMEDIES, IN WHICH, HE  
WAS NEVER CONSIDERED TO HAD BEEN DISABLED BY ANY  
MEDICAL SOCIETY OR ANY MEDICAL PROFESSIONAL AT  
THE AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES AGENCY?