


No. 21-7310 ORIGINAL

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES



Chris WARD Kline — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

MATTHEW Johns — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

United STATES Court of Appeals Ninth Circuit
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Chris WARD Kline
(Your Name)

237 Kearny St PMB 114
(Address)

San Francisco, CA 94108
(City, State, Zip Code)

415-513-9334
(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1) CAN A Federal Agency, H.H.S. (Health and Human Services) utilize State Secrets privilege to deny A person's Bill of Rights, Civil Rights and Human rights.

Fazaga vs. F.B.I. is currently awaiting review by the U.S. Supreme Court.

2) CAN members or employees of H.H.S. utilize State Secrets privilege on Attorney, Judges to influence court decisions.

3) Did District Court and Ninth Circuit review and utilize U.S.C. 42 with rulings and decisions which allow state and Federal courts for both monetary and injunctive relief of public health officials.

4) Should the Ninth Circuit have assigned counsel to the Plaintiff due to complexities of the Filings.

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

Ninth Circuit 21-16316

APPENDIX B

Northern California District 4:21-cv-03924-KAW

APPENDIX C

Number of Federal Frequency Assignments

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

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:

RELATED CASES

FARAGA vs. F.B.I
KATZ vs. United States
United State vs. United States
Chris Wynn Klin vs RAM 120PPAK
ORLIKOW vs United States

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

FARZAGH VS. F.B.I
Chris WARD Kline vs. Ram Huppaka
KATZ vs United States
United States vs. United States
Orlikow vs. United States

STATUTES AND RULES

Bill of Rights + 14th Admendment.
U.S.C. 42

OTHER

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 ninth circuit no 21-16314; 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 21-cv-03924-RAN Northern California; 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 Dec 7, 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. 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

An employee and/or a Federal Agency cannot deny a person's Bill of Rights and 14th Amendment, nor can they utilize state secrets privilege and technology for personal utilization to discredit, cover up and hide mistakes or use for retaliation for any reasons.

Furthermore, it can never be used on employees of Federal courts by any person of a different county, state or federal agencies.

No person or agency shall be granted or offered protection with supremacy clause or sovereign immunity if state secrets are used illegally, or unconstitutionally or outside scope of legal authorization.

CAN A Defendant use state secrets privilege on others within their own agency and DOJ officials to influence decisions for scope of Federal Employment Decisions.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Plaintiff Chris Wares Kline Filed restraining order in state court on Defendant as he was using state secrets technology illegally and outside scope of U.S.C. 42. Defendant removed case into Federal court in Northern California. Court dismissed case and Plaintiff appealed to Ninth Circuit Court. Ninth Circuit dismissed case as Privileged.

Plaintiff in his filings submitted scientific evidence which shows the mechanics on how states secrets Technology works.

V2K and implanted chips were never argued by Plaintiff, But only argued by defendant's lawyer in an attempt to discredit Plaintiff V2K and chips are often confused as what is actually states secrets Privilege and Technology.

District Court and Ninth Circuit did not look at evidence as Factual and decided or ruled as if Plaintiff not being truthful, when in fact, provided overwhelming evidence on equipment and Technology on states secrets Technology. The Technology is not classified and when agencies attempt to classify, it still is reviewable by the courts. Defendant failed to advise his lawyer and instead used to obtain favorable rulings.

Supremacy clause and Sovereign immunity can not be argued if Defendant utilized state secrets Privilege and Technology on officials who made "statements on Scope of Federal Employment" or used on his own attorneys, judges and the Ninth Circuit Court, not to mention, using on Plaintiff during all filings.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

When lawyers and Judges ARGue in court or rulings stating V2K or Chip implanted technology is frivolous or not accurate, it typically is a Federal Agency using states secrets to influence the court employees, lawyers and Judges for FAVORABLE rulings

The technology Plaintiff Chris WARR Rline ARGued with supporting evidence is accurate and is exactly how states secrets technology works to include Budget, satellite, computers, power lines CFSR. This is BACKed scientifically and is NOT CLASSIFIED.

Even if a defendant Matthew Johns had authorization to use state secrets technology, it would still be reviewable by the courts at the Federal level.


All states secrets technology is, is the utilization of high resolution video with the audio turned on. TABLE 2.1 ATTACHED shows that H.H.S. has access to this technology - See ATTACHED "Number of Federal Frequency Assignments

This document was presented as evidence by Plaintiff Chris Ward Rline. Case and rulings need to be reviewed as and with the assumption, backed by scientific evidence, some from H.H.S. internal documents, that Plaintiff Chris Ward Rline was truthful in all statements prepared and presented to District Court, 9th Circuit and with this writ of certiorari.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: 3/3/22