

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

21-7466

ANTHONY AANAND PATEL,

Plaintiff and Appellant,

vs.

SONYA BHATIA PATEL,

Defendant and Appellee.

) U.S. Supreme Court Case No.:
)

) Supreme Court of California Case
) Number: S271099

)

) California Court of Appeal Case
) Number: B307926

)

) Superior Court of California (County
) of Los Angeles) Case: BD585163

)

)

)

)

Petition Seeking Relief from Denial of Review by
The California Supreme Court
(dated: December 29, 2021)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI AND MANDATE FOR
PRIOR APPROVAL FROM U.S. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
BEFORE FEDERAL OR STATE JUDGES MAY ISSUE ANY
FURTHER ORDERS IN ANY CASE OR CONTROVERSY
PENDING IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Anthony A. Patel
553 N. Pacific Coast Hwy.,
Suite B-522
Redondo Beach, CA 90277
Phone: (424) 350-0123
Fax: (310) 943-3829
Email: tony@tonypatel.com
Plaintiff and Appellant
In Propria Persona

RECEIVED

MAR 25 2022

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

1. Why does wasting Appellant's time in this sixth (6th) request for relief in this Court in less than 12 months prove that all judges in the United States of America require mandatory continuing legal education (MCLE) as dictated by U.S. Congress?

2. Why must the U.S. Department of Defense grant prior approval in the interests of National Security before any federal or state judge may ever issue any further rulings again in the United States of America?

3. Why must the 46th Commander in Chief declare Martial Law once this Court ignored Appellant five times past?

4. Why will Orders always be given by the President and Vice President to federal judges who waste Appellant's time?

5. Why does Justice Breyer know the law best among judges in America since December 12, 2000, and is thus, doing the only useful thing a judicial officer can do now by resigning?

6. Why did the California Supreme Court and lower courts not care that over 130 corrupt federal judges broke the law for at least a decade (or more)?

7. Why is Respondent (Sonya Bhatia, Esq.) an Unfit Parent for the last 10 years because she complies with judges of this Court rather than every Congress and President since 1789?

8. Why is the only useful thing by this Court in 2022 the attempted recitation of *The Gettysburg Address* on January 27?

9. Why will U.S. Military Law explain that Congress and the Executive Branch are Divorcing Every Judge in America as soon as any judge wastes a moment of Appellant's time?

LIST OF PARTIES

ANTHONY AANAND PATEL, an individual, Plaintiff and Appellant.

SONYA BHATIA PATEL, Defendant and Appellee.

CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

I, Anthony A. Patel, do hereby certify that there are no publicly-held companies or corporations as interested entities or persons to list in this Statement.



DATED: March 21, 2022

Anthony A. Patel

LIST OF PROCEEDINGS

Anthony Aanand Patel vs. Sonya Bhatia Patel, Supreme Court of California Court, Docket Case Number: S271099. Date of Entry of Order Denying Petition for Review: December 29, 2021.

Anthony Aanand Patel vs. Sonya Bhatia Patel, California Court of Appeal, Docket Case Number: B307926. Date of Appellate Order: September 3, 2021.

Anthony Aanand Patel vs. Sonya Bhatia Patel, Superior Court of California (County of Los Angeles) Docket Case Number: BD585163. Underlying Case.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW | 2 |
| LIST OF PARTIES | 3 |
| CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT | 4 |
| LIST OF PROCEEDINGS | 5 |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | 6 |
| TABLE OF AUTHORITIES | 7 |
| JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT | 8 |
| LEGAL ISSUES IN THIS CASE | 9 |
| STATEMENT OF FACTS | 10 |
| STATEMENT OF CASE | 11 |
| REASONS IN SUPPORT OF WRIT | 12 |
| ARGUMENT | 13 |
| CONCLUSION | 14 |
| APPENDIX: | |
| Order of California Supreme Court (December 29, 2021) | |
| Order of California Court of Appeal (September 3, 2021) | |
| Denial of Judicial Notice in Court of Appeal (September 28, 2021) | |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Presiding Law

The Uniform Code of Military Justice *passim*

Court Rules

Rules of The United States Supreme Court

Rule 10 13

Rule 12 13

Rule 13 8

Constitutions and Treatises

United States Constitution *passim*

Article I 9

Article II 9

Governing International Legal Principles

Universal Declaration of Human Rights 9

United Nations Charter 9

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

The jurisdiction of the U.S. Supreme Court is proper in this case as the petition for review in this proceeding was denied by the California Supreme Court on December 29, 2021. The deadline to file this instant petition for a writ of certiorari is 90 days. Rule 13.

This petition flows directly from denial of review by a state court of last resort on December 29, 2021. Thus, this Court's final jurisdiction is customary and proper in such cases which arise from state courts.

LEGAL ISSUES IN THIS CASE

The issues in this case stem from the five prior proceedings before this Court during the past twelve (12) months:

Case No. 20-7450: Anthony A. Patel, Petitioner v. Regents of the University of California

Case No. 20-7555: Anthony A. Patel, Petitioner v. Patricia Miller, et al.

Case No. 20-7747: Anthony A. Patel, Petitioner v. Charles Robinson, et al.

Case No. 20-8210: Anthony A. Patel, Petitioner v. Superior Court of California, Los Angeles County, et al.

Case No. 21-6365: Anthony A. Patel, Petitioner v. Patricia Miller, et al.

The principal legal issues in this instant sixth (6th) case include the following pertinent matters:

The applicability of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) to supersede civilian law and order until further notice.

How Articles I and II of the United States Constitution effectively trumped every judge in America on November 8, 2016.

Why the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) will be part of MCLE training for all U.S. judges in the future.

Explaining why U.S. judges will be required to study and pass an examination which covers international law and the United Nations Charter since 1945 in order to be readmitted to active law practice once disbarred pursuant to Martial Law.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

Appellant Anthony A. Patel ("Patel") sought a dissolution from Respondent Sonya Bhatia Patel ("Bhatia"). Appellant Patel aligned himself with Congress and the Executive Branch in 2012. Respondent Bhatia aligned herself with the Judicial Branch in 2012. The parties divorced and litigated over the ensuing 10 years into 2022 as to which branch(es) of U.S. Government faithfully represent the *best interests* of their minor children.

STATEMENT OF CASE

Patel sued for dissolution in 2013 in case BD585163 in the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles. The parties stipulated to a divorce and certain final orders. After this stipulated final judgment, California judges nevertheless sanctioned Patel and declared him a vexatious litigant for supporting Articles I & II of the Constitution instead of Article III of the Constitution.

REASONS IN SUPPORT OF WRIT

The reasons for the writ are supported by the five prior cases, and now this sixth case, in this Court:

Case No. 20-7450: Anthony A. Patel, Petitioner v. Regents of the University of California

Case No. 20-7555: Anthony A. Patel, Petitioner v. Patricia Miller, et al.

Case No. 20-7747: Anthony A. Patel, Petitioner v. Charles Robinson, et al.

Case No. 20-8210: Anthony A. Patel, Petitioner v. Superior Court of California, Los Angeles County, et al.

Case No. 21-6365: Anthony A. Patel, Petitioner v. Patricia Miller, et al.

The Court is aligned with special interests and is full of corrupt federal judges. Thus, federal judges favor their own interests instead of Congress and the Executive. State judges follow the footsteps of their brethren – federal judges. Hence, the 46th Commander in Chief will have no choices but to impose Martial Law in order to safeguard the interests of all Americans during the remainder of 2022. Once the new Congress is elected and situated in 2023, and after all federal judges are removed and disbarred from active legal practice, the next Congress and the President can together appoint a new federal judiciary in 2023. Military orders will govern America until further notice.

ARGUMENT

Appellant asks this Court to grant this writ petition because the issues that he has raised are of substantial importance. Supreme Court Rules 10 and 12. This writ concerns corruption in the federal judiciary and harm to the interests of all Americans thereof.

Like the California Court of Appeal, the State court of last resort (The California Supreme Court), has departed from the customary and usual norms of law practice. Courts in America are making decisions that are contrary to the national defense. The mindset of judges in the U.S. currently favors all of the tough adversaries of the United States. Hence, Martial Law is required.

The supervisory power of the United States Supreme Court is required such that all lower courts are ordered to seek approval from the Defense Department until further notice. Courts have shown disdain and outright contempt for Americans during the past decade. The 46th Commander in Chief must declare Martial Law in order to protect the American People from the disgusting abuse of judges in America during the past decade.


The Court has one final opportunity to grant this Petition and take control of this situation per Appellant. Alternatively, if this Petition is not timely granted, the 46th President and 49th Vice President will proceed with Martial Law for the remainder of 2022. No vote on impeachment will be scheduled, and even when such a vote is held in 2023, the 46th Commander in Chief will be easily acquitted in the U.S. Senate of placing every judge under house arrest during the spring and summer of 2022.

CONCLUSION

The nine idiots in charge of this Court still live under the same false premise as Respondent Bhatia today – that some dumb family law judge, not Congress nor the President (or Vice President), know the *best interests* of minor children such as Appellee Bhatia's two children (aged 13 and 10.5 currently). This misconception will be punished by the 46th Commander in Chief.

The 46th Commander in Chief follows the prior 45 presidents. Thus, judicial disobedience to the U.S. Military and contempt shown by federal judges to our military and troops would be punished in 2022 by the 46th president (on behalf of his 45 predecessors) in a manner never witnessed in at least eight centuries since the *Magna Carta*. The Court is kindly requested to instead grant this Petition in lieu of continuing to try and test the Power of every U.S. Congress and its Commander in Chief since 1789. Congress and the Executive will determine the scope, extent, nature and application of U.S. Military Law. Civilian judges are neither necessary nor permitted during Martial Law.

The Court may soon be in recess for the rest of spring and summer per U.S. Military Orders. Once the Court is allowed by the 46th Commander in Chief to resume normal operations later this year in fall 2022, Appellant requests that the Court grant this Petition consistent with the *best interests* of his two children.



DATED: March 21, 2022

Anthony A. Patel
Plaintiff and Appellant
In Pro Per