

No. _____

21-7310 Rule 44 Rehearing

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

21-7310 U.S. Supreme Court
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Chris WARD Kline
(Your Name)

237 Kearny St 114
(Address)

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

415-513-9334
(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

- Petitioner Chris Kline is asking for rehearing per rule 44, based on high probability of illegal influence using technology to attempt to influence court members violating 18 U.S.C. Section 1503.
- 1) Did District Court, 9th Circuit Court and Solicitor General error in not reporting a potential crime to the DOJ and to conduct an investigation on potential and actual influence. Petitioner Chris Kline contacted Both U.S. Attorney and Solicitor General to report the crime in a timely fashion. Petitioner also reported to the OIG HHS.
 - 2) Could Petitioner have received a Fair hearing since he was on electronic surveillance by Matthew Johns using states secrets technology. Electronic Surveillance and states secrets allows operator Matthew Johns to use All source, to include open and closed as well as SIGINT that allowed illegally, Respondent Johns to obtain personal, confidential and private information that was used against Petitioner. It also allows Respondent to intercept this data, alter or replace data so that Respondent can illegally influence Petitioner, others around Petitioner or to obtain FAVORABLE court rulings.
 - 3) Does recent Supreme Court case United States v. Jose Luis Vazello MAOERO give petitioner equal protection under 5th Amendment Due Process clause as Respondent Matthew Johns violated Petitioner Chris Kline's rights and privileges protected by Constitution and laws of states and Federal government. This would be a violation of Title 18 U.S.C. Section 242. Petitioner Chris Kline is an American citizen, residing in California and pays taxes.

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

- 1) United STATES v. Jose Luis VARELLA MADERO
- 2) VANI Burren v. United STATES
- 3) FAZAGA v. F.B.I
- 4) Chris WARD Kline v RAM KOPPAKA
- 5) KATZ v. United STATES

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 Supreme	Court NO 21-7310
APPENDIX D Number	of Federal Frequency 1755-1850 MHz Bond
APPENDIX E	
APPENDIX F	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
1) United STATES v. Jose Louis VARELA Mayero	15, 16
2) VANI Burren v. United STATES	15, 16
3) FAZAGH v. F.B.I.	15, 16

STATUTES AND RULES	
1) Rule 44	14, 15, 16
2) Title 18 U.S.C. Section 1503	
3) Title 18 U.S.C. Section 242	
4) Title 18 U.S.C. Section 1030	
5) Computer Fraud AND Abuse Act 1986	

OTHER

~~Rule 44~~ cml

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 # 21-16316; 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-RAW 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 December 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

MATTHEW JOHNS used his credentials with computers, Public Health Equipment to utilize in an improper and illegal manner to deprive rights and privileges and to influence members of state and federal courts.

MATTHEW JOHNS violated

- 1) Title 18 U.S.C. Section 1030
- 2) Title 18 U.S.C. Section 1503
- 3) Computer Fraud and Abuse Act 1986
- 4) Title 18 U.S.C. Section 242

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Petitioner Chris Ward Kline is a citizen of the United States who resides in California, thus as ruled in *United States v. Jose Luis VARELA MADRERO*, petitioner shall have equal protection under 5th Amendment Due Process and granted All Rights and privileges under State, Federal and the Constitution.

Respondent Matthew Johns placed and/or maintained electronic surveillance on Petitioner which restricted or violated his rights and privileges. Johns used electronic surveillance as retaliation and to intimidate, harass, threaten by using his credentials to access computer systems and public health systems illegally which violated Computer Fraud and Abuse Act of 1986, Title 18, U.S.C., section 1030 with reference *UAW Durren v. United States*.

Petitioner presented scientific and factual data and evidence backed by accepted educational, science and technology protocols.

As case went to state court, Federal District court, 9th Circuit and the Supreme Court (Docket 217310), Johns used his credentials illegally and in violation of Title 18 U.S.C. section 1503 by using technology such as "States Secrets" (reference *FAZAGH V. UNITED F.B.I.*) to place real time text-to-voice and computer programs to alter a person's self ideology and vocabulary to influence for favorable rulings. The technology does NOT allow person's inner voice and self ideology alone until that person agrees with what is presented by Respondent Matthew Johns or the computer program. This technology was presented in 1975 church committee and is restricted to few agencies and individuals, which Matthew Johns would be one of these few.

Matthew Johns was a member of the Epidermology Intelligence Service who uses this technology. Matthew Johns is a Senior Official within U.S. Public Health Commission corps which is one of eight military branches. Matthew Johns is the Regional Administrator who has Top Secret clearance and communicates with the Office of National Security under H.H.S. to classify certain information up mistakes and crimes used this technology on members of the courts to include the Supreme Court, classified the info and for personal use.

Petitioner Chris Ward Kline reported these crimes to Respondents U.S. Attorney's to include the Solicitor General and the reports were not referred to the P.O.J., which should have investigated as required by law.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Petitioner request a rehearing on Rule 44 AS
Paper work was completed and placed in U.S. mail
within 25 days from 4/18/2022 denied petition.


Petitioner Chris Wren Kline has submitted probable
cause that Respondent Matthew Johns violated
Computer Fraud and Abuse Act of 1986 and Title
18 U.S.C. 18, Sections 1030, 1503 and 242. These
crimes were reported as required by the courts and
LAW. The evidence is recorded at H.H.S. Office of
National Security, the Pentagon and Federal courts and
the Department of Justice has access to this
information.

Petitioner request granting the petition and
remand to District Court with legal representation
granted by courts and/or summary judgement.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "RLH" followed by a flourish, is written over a horizontal line.

Date:

5/8/2022