

NO. 21-20601


21-7531

ORIGINAL

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

MICHAEL GEOFFREY PETERS
PETITIONER



VS,

CITY OF HOUSTON

STATE OF TEXAS

HARRIS COUNTY

RESPONDENTS

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE UNITED STATES FIFTH CIRCUIT

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

MICHAEL GEOFFREY PETERS

1200 RM 655

ROSHARON, TEXAS 77583

(281) 595-3413

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1. Whether or not a state can imprison a political prisoner to silence his freedom of speech exposing their Racketeering crimes, then steal his home(s)?

See Case USCA5 #19-20717.

2. Whether or not the court can refuse to correspond with a defendant to deny him due process of the laws in order to steal his ~~home(s)~~ home(s)?

3. Whether or not the City of Houston can deny me my ability to pay my "taxes" in order to steal my home?

4. Whether or not the state can retaliate against me for exposing State Racketeering crimes by stealing my home(s)?

LIST OF PARTIES

1. THE STATE OF TEXAS
TEXAS ATTORNEY GENERAL (KEN PAXTON)
P.O. BOX 12548
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78711-2548
2. CITY OF HOUSTON, (TEXAS)
ATTORNEY(S): LINEBARGER, GOGGAN, BLAIR
AND SAMPSON, L.L.P.
3. HARRIS COUNTY (HOUSTON, TEXAS)
DISTRICT ATTORNEY: KIM OGGS

RELATED CASES

- 1A. ANNULMENT CASE NO. 12-08-09259-CR
1. STATES CONSPIRACY: SILENCING WHISTLE-BLOWERS FREE SPEECH,
USCA5# 19-20717
 2. SOUTHERN DISTRICT (HOUSTON, TEXAS)
4:20-CV-2044
 3. FIFTH CIRCUIT
20-20-20481

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3-4
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	5-12
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	13-15
CONCLUSION	16.

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX "A" U.S. SOUTHERN DIST.
COURTS DECISION

APPENDIX "B" U.S. FIFTH CIRCUITS
DECISION

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 judge-
ment below.

OPINIONS BELOW

1. The U.S. Southern District Courts decision,
Houston Division, Case No. 4:21-CV-2969
Appendix "A".
2. The U.S. Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals
decision, Case No. 21-20601
Appendix "B".

Decisions are from federal courts both unreport-
ed to cover-up thefts.

JURISDICTION

Federal Courts:

1. The date on which the U.S. Southern Dist. Court made their decision was on October 27th, 2021.
2. The date on which the U.S. Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals made their decision was on: January 3, 2022.

The jurisdiction of this court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. Section 1254(1).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

First Amendment. Protect freedom of speech and gives the people the right to redress their grievances without being falsely imprisoned and government theft of his/her property.

Fifth Amendment. A person shall not be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of the law, meaning the "presentation" of my own defense and witnesses exposing state crimes! And cover-ups. . . .

Sixth Amendment. In "all" criminal prosecutions a defendant shall enjoy the right to compulsory process for obtaining "witnesses" in his favor. (Denied)

Eighth Amendment. Right to bail, denied

Fourteenth Amendment. No "State" shall de-
prive any person of his life, liberty or
property without "due process" of the law;
nor deny any person within its jurisdiction
the equal protect of the laws

Z was deprived every Constitutional/
right by a State gone corrupt for
corporate bribes.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

THIS CASE IS DIRECTLY RELATED TO THE STATE OF TEXAS RETALIATIONS AGAINST ME AS A STATE WHISTLEBLOWER. THE STATE PROTECTS THE CRIMES OF STATES WITNESSES; ZOHAN ECKERT DREYER, M.D., TO COVER-UP FOR THE BILLION DOLLAR CORPORATIONS OF BAYLOR AND TEXAS CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL SHE MADE LIABLE BY FABRICATING MEDICAL RECORDS TO DECEIVE DISTRICT COURT JUDGE; JENNIFER RUBIN, IN MY ANNULMENT. SEE MONTGOMERY COUNTY COURTHOUSE CASE NO. 12-08-09259-CR.

I.

THE PLAINTIFF IN MY CRIMINAL CASE NO. 14-07-08259-CR, JUDGE TRACY ALLEN GILBERT (BAYLOR GRADUATE) MET WITH CORPORATE ATTORNEYS FROM SAID CORPORATIONS UNETHICALLY AND THEREAFTER COVERED-UP

DRIVER'S CRIMES, WHO ALSO TESTIFIED TO PROTECT THEM.

II.

SEE SUPREME COURT CASE NO. USCA5# 19-20717 FOR SUPPORTING EVIDENCE AND FIFTH CIRCUIT APPEAL, CASE NO. 19-20717. ALL TEXAS COURTS COVERED UP FOR HER CORPORATE CRIME. GOV. OF TEXAS; RICK PERRY HIRED AT HIS DISCRETION THE DIRECTOR OF THE TEXAS MEDICAL BOARD; DR. IRVIN ZETTLER WHO ALSO COVER UP SAID CORPORATE CRIMES AS DID FIFTH CIRCUIT JUDGE; GREGG ACOSTA OF "HOUSTON", TEXAS. EVEN THE SUPREME COURT CLERK HER REFUSES TO FILE MY CERTIORARI OR STATE THE REASONS WHY.

III.

TEXAS ATTORNEY GENERAL; KEH PAXTON

AND DISTRICT ATTORNEY; KIM OGS REFUSE TO PROSECUTE DREYER'S CRIMES OF:

1. AGGRAVATED PERJURY
2. CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY
3. MEDICAL RECORDS FRAUD (MEDICAL BOARD)
4. PHYSICAL EVIDENCE FABRICATION
5. FRAUD

TO PROTECT THESE CORPORATIONS FROM THEIR LIABILITY, HENCE THEY'VE DENIED ME MY DEFENSE, DEFENSE WITNESSES, EVIDENCE SUBMITTALS, DISCOVERY AND LEGAL COUNSEL NOT WORKING TO AID THEIR COVER UPS, AGAINST MY FIRST, SIXTH, EIGHTH, FOURTEENTH AND FIFTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS.

IV

TEXAS ATTORNEY GENERAL; KEVIN PAXTON HAS HIS STATE COURTS STEAL MY PROP-

ERTV IN RETALIATION FOR EXPOSING GOV.
RICK PERRY IN 2012 FOR HIS COVER UP
WHO WAS RUNNING FOR UNITED STATES
PRESIDENT ALONG WITH DONALD TRUMP.

V.

GOV. GREGG ABBOTT ALSO SEEMS TO BECOME
U.S. PRESIDENT AND ALONG WITH HIS
ATTORNEY GENERAL, PATTON KEEP ME
FROM EXPOSING STATE RACKETEERING
AND COLLUSION CRIMES BY FALSE IMPR-
ISONMENT AND RETALIATIONS.

VI.

SEE CASE NO. 20-20481 FIFTH CIRCUIT.
EVIDENCE PROVES THAT HARRIS COUNTY
COURT CLERK; MARILYN BURGESS AND THE
JUDGE OF THE 164TH DISTRICT COURT
LOCATED AT: 201 CAROLINE STREET, 4TH FL.

HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002, DID REFUSE ME
ALL OUR PROTECTS OF THE CIVIL OR EQUAL
PROTECTIONS THEREOF TO STEAL MY
LAND AND HOME LOCATED WITHIN THE
CITY'S ENTER LOOP, AN EXPENSIVE ~~PRE~~
PROPERTY, IN RETALIATION FOR RUINING
RICK PERRY'S ELECTION BY MAKING
"YOUTUBE" VIDEOS, CALLING HIM A CHILD
MOLESTER FOR PROTECTING SAID CORP.
ORATE CRIMES BY USING HIS APPOINT-
ED DIRECTOR, DR. IRVIN ZETHEMER, DIR-
ECTOR OF THE TEXAS MEDICAL BOARD
TO COVER-UP DREYER'S CRIMES FOR POLI-
TICAL RUINING FROM SAID CORPORAT-
IONS...

VII.

COURT CLERK, BURGESS REFUSED TO
FILE MY MOTIONS OR COUNTER SUIT.

WHILE CITY OF HOUSTON ATTORNEYS;
LINDBARGER, GOGGAN, BLAIR AND SAMPSON,
L.L.P., FILED CHARGES AGAINST ME TO
PAY BACK TAX'S OF APPROX \$8,000.00
DOLLAR ON THE PROPERTY MY FATHER
FILED A LEIN ON IN THE (70'S). WHEN
I WROTE AND STATED I'D PAY THE
~~THE~~ TAX'S FOR THE "TITLE" WHICH WAS
RIGHTFUL MINE, THEY STOPPED ALL
COMMUNICATIONS AND STOLE MY
PROPERTY, DENYING ME MY CONSTI-
TUTIONAL RIGHTS TO EQUAL PROTECTIONS,
DUE PROCESS, THEFT AND FALSE IMPRI-
SONMENT.

VIII.


EVERY JUDGE AND GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL
FROM THE TRIAL COURT TO THE SUP-
10.

RENAME COURT CLERK, SCOTT HARRIS HAS
DENIED ME DUE PROCESS OF THE LAW
FOR THE PAST ~~10~~ TEN (10) YEARS, IN
VIOLATION OF ALL CIV CONSTITUTIONAL
RIGHTS. I AM A TEXAS STATE POL-
ITICAL PRISONER.


RELIEF

RELIEF SHOULD BE GRANTED FOR THE
DENIAL OF DUE PROCESS OR EQUAL
PROTECTIONS OF THE LAW.

7014 0510 0001 9574 1805

U.S. Postal Service™ <i>Peters #209190</i>		
CERTIFIED MAIL™ RECEIPT		
(Domestic Mail Only; No Insurance Coverage Provided)		
For delivery information, visit our website at www.usps.com		
OFFICIAL USE		
Postage \$		Postmark Here
Certified Fee		
Return Receipt Fee (Endorsement Required)		
Restricted Delivery Fee (Endorsement Required)		
Total Postage & Fees \$		
Sent To Marilyn Burgess / Court Clerk Street, Apt. No., PO Box No. 201 Caroline, 4th Fl. City, State, ZIP+4 Houston, TX 77002 PS Form 3800, August 2006 See Reverse for Instructions		

7012 1010 0001 5558 7034

U.S. Postal Service™ <i>Peters #209190</i>		
CERTIFIED MAIL™ RECEIPT		
(Domestic Mail Only; No Insurance Coverage Provided)		
For delivery information, visit our website at www.usps.com		
OFFICIAL USE		
Postage \$		Postmark Here
Certified Fee		
Return Receipt Fee (Endorsement Required)		
Restricted Delivery Fee (Endorsement Required)		
Total Postage & Fees \$		
Sent To Marilyn Burgess Dist. Clerk Street, Apt. No., PO Box No. 201 Caroline St. 4th Fl City, State, ZIP+4 Houston Texas 77002 PS Form 3800, August 2006 See Reverse for Instructions		

14 HURD COMMUNICATIONS.

FOR CONSPIRACY, RETALIATIONS, THEFT
AND THE DEPRIVATIONS OF ALL CONSTI-
TUTIONAL RIGHTS, DUE PROCESS OR EQUAL
PROTECTIONS, LOSS OF PROPERTY & SEEK
(\$1,333,000,000.00) MILLION DOLLAR IN
DAMAGES.

AS THE STATE AND ITS COURTS
RETALIATE AND REFUSE TO COMMUN-
ICATE WITH ME, THEY HAVE ALL
FILINGS. & SEEK A FEDERAL INVEST-
IGATION INTO CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY,
PROPERTY THEFT AND THE DEPRIVAT-
IONS OF ALL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS
TO PROTECT CORPORATE CRIMINALS
DUE TO BRIBES AND POLITICAL FUND-
INGS.

Respectfully submitted

Michael C. Peterson

Petitioner 0-17-2022
12.

REASONS FOR GRANTING PETITION

1. While silencing the petitioner through intentionally having him wrongfully imprisoned to prevent being exposed for State Racketeering and Collusion crimes, See Supreme Court Case No. USCA5 #19-20717 the Respondents denied him all due process of the law, completely ignoring all his petitions and motions, refused to communicate or answer his correspondence in order to steal his home in Houston.
2. The State of Texas, its government has conspired to punish the petitioner for being a Whistleblower and retaliates by stealing his homes. See Case 12-08-09259 Montgomery County, Texas Courthouse, 2012
3. The Prison Litigation Reform Act (P.L.R.A.)

clearly state that First Amendment Rights do not apply to the "three-strikes" provision. The courts covering-up for state Political Judicial and Corporate Recklessness tentatively ignore this.

4. Fifth Amendment (1789) states: A person shall not be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of the law.
5. Fourteenth Amendment (1868) states: No state shall deprive any person of life liberty or property without due process of the law; nor deny any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the law.
6. First Amendment (1789) states: Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the "free exercise" thereof or abridging the "freedom of speech"

or the press, or the right of the people
to peacefully assemble and to petition
the government for a redress of grievances.

The state has violated my constitutional
right to redress, as well as equal pro-
tections, to silence my free speech
exposing them and retaliating by
stealing my property, imprisoning
me and denying me due process to
my defense, witnesses or discovery etc.

7. Sixth Amendment (1789) states "In all criminal
prosecutions a defendant shall enjoy the right
to compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in
his favor." Yet Z was denied all witnesses
in case no 19-20717 and 12-08-09259-CR in
Montgomery County. 15.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, everyone is entitled to due process, but this Court, the 164th closed its doors and retreated like a turtle into its shell to ~~see~~ accommodate the state in its retaliations for political opinion. State retaliation is illegal as is the blatant theft of my home(s). This petition should be granted for the deprivations of all Constitutional Rights.

Respectfully submitted

Michael C. Petru

January 17, 2022

Appendix "A"

United States District Court
Southern District of Texas

ENTERED

October 27, 2021

Nathan Ochsner, Clerk

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION

MICHAEL G. PETERS,
(TDCJ #2019190)

Plaintiff,

vs.

CITY OF HOUSTON, *et al.*,

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Homes ☺

CIVIL ACTION NO. 4:21-cv-2969

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

Plaintiff Michael G. Peters is presently incarcerated in the Texas Department of Criminal Justice – Correctional Institutions Division (TDCJ) at the Stringfellow Unit in Rosharon. Peters has filed a civil-rights complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (Dkt. No. 1) against the City of Houston, the State of Texas, and Harris County, alleging that the defendants stole his property, land, and home. Peters has also filed a motion requesting leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* (Dkt. No. 2). That motion will be denied and this case will be dismissed for the reasons explained below.

This civil action is governed by the Prison Litigation Reform Act (PLRA), which was enacted, in part, to prevent prisoners from abusing the privilege of proceeding *in forma pauperis*. See *Adepegba v. Hammons*, 103 F.3d 383, 387 (5th Cir. 1996), *abrogated on other grounds by Coleman v. Tollefson*, 575 U.S. 532, 537 (2015). Under the “three-strikes” rule established by the PLRA, a prisoner is not allowed to bring a civil action without prepaying the filing fee if, while incarcerated, three or more of his civil actions or appeals have been dismissed as frivolous, malicious, or for failure to state a claim upon

which relief may be granted, unless he is in “imminent danger of serious physical injury.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) ; *Lomax v. Ortiz-Marquez*, — U.S. —, 140 S. Ct. 1721, 1723 (2020) (observing that the three-strikes rule was established to “help staunch a ‘flood of nonmeritorious’ prisoner cases”) (quoting *Jones v. Bock*, 549 U.S. 199, 203 (2007)).

Court records confirm that Peters, who has filed more than 70 civil actions and appeals in the federal courts while incarcerated, has incurred well over three strikes for filing frivolous and malicious cases: (1) *Peters v. Gilbert*, No. 4:15-cv-2762 (S.D. Tex. Oct. 1, 2015) (dismissed as frivolous); (2) *Peters v. Tex. Medical Board*, No. 4:15-cv-2858 (S.D. Tex. Oct. 8, 2015) (dismissed as frivolous and for failure to state a claim); (3) *Peters v. Tex. Children’s Hospital, et al.*, No. 4:15-cv-2900 (S.D. Tex. Oct. 6, 2015) (dismissed as malicious and for failure to state a claim); (4) *Peters v. Dr. Dreyer*, No. 4:15-cv-2899 (S.D. Tex. Oct. 14, 2015) (dismissed for failure to state a claim); (5) *Peters v. Harrison, et al.*, No. 4:15-cv-3037 (S.D. Tex. Oct. 19, 2015) (dismissed as frivolous and for failure to state a claim); (6) *Peters v. Valigura*, No. 4:15-cv-3023 (S.D. Tex. Oct. 27, 2015) (dismissed as frivolous and for failure to state a claim); (7) *Peters v. Duckworth*, No. 4:15-cv-3024 (S.D. Tex. Oct. 22, 2015) (dismissed as frivolous and for failure to state a claim); (8) *Peters v. State of Texas*, No. 4:17-cv-1459 (S.D. Tex. May 17, 2017) (dismissed for failure to state a claim); and (9) *Peters v. State of Texas*, No. 4:18-cv-261 (S.D. Tex. Jan. 31, 2018) (dismissed as frivolous and for failure to state a claim).

Many other cases filed by Peters have been dismissed as barred by the three-strikes rule. Peters has also incurred monetary sanctions for his abuse of judicial resources. *See Peters v. State of Texas*, No. 4:18-cv-261 (S.D. Tex. Jan. 31, 2018) (Dkt. No. 5, at 4)

(imposing sanctions in the amount of \$400.00); *Peters v. State of Texas*, Civil No. 3:21-cv-166 (S.D. Tex. July 9, 2021) (Dkt. No. 5, at 5) (imposing another strike and sanctions in the amount of \$402.00, warning further that Peters may be subject to additional sanctions if he continues to abuse judicial resources by filing repetitive, frivolous complaints).

Because Peters has more than three strikes for purposes of § 1915(g), he is barred from proceeding *in-forma pauperis* in any civil action or appeal unless he demonstrates that an imminent danger of serious physical injury exists at the time his complaint is filed. *See Banos v. O'Guin*, 144 F.3d 883, 885 (5th Cir. 1998) (per curiam). The current complaint does not fit within the exception to the three-strikes rule.

Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS** as follows:

1. The motion for leave to proceed *in-forma pauperis* filed by Michael G. Peters (Dkt. No. 2) is **DENIED**.
2. This lawsuit is **DISMISSED** without prejudice as barred by the three-strikes rule found in 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).
3. Peters may re-file this lawsuit only if he pre-pays the full amount of the filing fee for a civil action (\$402.00).

The Clerk will provide a copy of this order to the Manager of the Three-Strikes List for the Southern District of Texas at Three_Strikes@txs.uscourts.gov.

SIGNED at Houston, Texas, on 10/27/21.



ALFRED H. BENNETT
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE