


NO 21-266247

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES



MICHAEL G. PETERS - PETITIONER

VS.

KENNETH M. HOYT - RESPONDENT

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

UNITED STATE FIFTH CIRCUIT

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

MICHAEL GEOFFREY PETERS

STRINGFELLOW UNIT

1200 FM 655

ROSHARON, TEXAS 77583

(281) 595-3413

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1. WHETHER ITS ETHICAL FOR FELLOW JUDICIARY MEMBERS FROM THE SAME COURTHOUSE TO PRESIDE OVER ONE ANOTHERS ETHICS IN CIVIL MATTERS?
2. WHEN REPUBLICAN JUDGES FROM THE SAME COURTHOUSE ~~REPEAT~~^{MSR} REPEATEDLY COVER-UP CORPORATE CRIMES BECAUSE SAID CORPORATIONS FUND THEIR POLITICAL PARTY AND CONTINUOUSLY DISMISS ALL CIVIL ACTIONS IN CONNECTION WITH EXPOSING THEM FOR COLLUSION CRIMES IS IT ETHICAL TO PRESIDE OVER AND INFLUENCE OR TAKE PART IN THEIR OWN COVER-UP?
3. IS IT LEGAL FOR THESE JUDGES TO CONTINUOUSLY DISMISS SAID CIVIL ACTIONS

BY MISAPPLYING OR CITING THE LAWS TO SUIT THEIR OWN POLITICAL AGENDAS?

4. IS IT LAWFUL FOR THESE SAME JUDGES TO UNITE AND CONSPIRE AGAINST INNOCENT AMERICAN CITIZENS TO PREVENT THEM FROM ACQUIRING JUSTICE TO PROTECT THE REPUBLICAN PARTY?
5. IS IT PROPER FOR THESE SAME JUDGES TO REFUSE TO INVESTIGATE OR VIEW RELATED EVIDENCE PROVING THEIR OWN COVER-UPS OR TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION THE EVIDENCE TO CONTINUE THEIR COVER-UPS?

LIST OF PARTIES

1. MICHAEL G. PETERS
2. DAVID MITTNER

IN THE CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY THE FOLLOWING COURTS AND JUDGES ARE PART OF RACKETEERING, COLLUSION, FALSE IMPRISONMENT, CONSPIRACY, JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT ETC. ETC.

NINTH CIRCUIT	JUDGE JOHNSON
MONTHOMERY CO.	TRACY A. GILBERT
	LISA B. MICHAEL

SOUTHERN DIST.	JEFFREY BROVIN
GALVESTON	

SOUTHERN DIST.	DAVID MITTNER
HOUSTON	NANCY F. ATLAS
	SIM LAKE
	GEORGE C. HANKS
	KRITH A. ELLISON
	LEW H. ROSENTHAL
	<u>III.</u>

LYNN N. HUGHES

ALFRED H. BENNETT

CHARLES ESKRIDGE

SUPREME COURT

AMY CONEY BARRETT

JOHN ROBERT

RELATED CASES

19-20717 FIFTH CIRCUIT

A MULTITUDE OF FILED CIVIL ACTIONS
ESTIMATED AT EIGHTY-FIVE (85) ARE ALL
ASSOCIATED PREDICATE ACTS RELATED TO

THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT COURTS COVER-UPS.

SEE: COURT CLERK RECORDS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	
REASONS FOR GRANTING WRIT	
CONCLUSION	

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX "A" SOUTHERN DIST. DECISION

APPENDIX "B" FIFTH CIRCUIT'S DECISION

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED PAGE NO.

CASES

Marshall vs. Jerrico Inc., 446 US 238 64 L.Ed 182 100 S. Ct. 1610 (1980)	10
Methew vs. Eldridge; 424 U.S. 318 , 319 344, 96 S. Ct. 893 907 (1976)	15
Murles vs. Ryan; 706 F. 3d 1021 (CA9 2013)	15-16
Brey vs. Gramley; 520 U.S. 899, 904, 117 S.Ct. 1793, 138 L. Ed. 2d 97 (1997).	16
Withrow vs. Larkin; 421 U.S. 35, 46, 95 S. Ct. 1456, 43 L. Ed. 2d (1975).	16
Withrow, 421 U.S. at 47, 95 S. Ct 1456	17
Murles	17
Atena Life Co. vs. Lavoie; 475 U.S. 813 106 S. Ct. 1580 89 L. Ed. 2d 823 (1986).	17
Carpentoni; 556 U.S. at 883 129 S. Ct. 2252.	17

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

OPINIONS BELOW

THE OPINION IN THE FEDERAL COURT IN
APPENDIX "B" IS UNPUBLISHED TO COVER-UP
THEIR CONSPIRACY.

THE OPINION IN THE STATE COURT IN
APPENDIX "A" IS UNPUBLISHED TO COVER-UP
THEIR CONSPIRACY.

JURISDICTION

FEDERAL COURT:

THE DATE ON WHICH THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS DECIDED MY CASE WAS JANUARY 18, 2022. SEE APPENDIX "B".

THE JURISDICTION OF THIS COURT IS INVOLVED UNDER 28 U.S.C. SEC. 1254(1).
STATE COURT:

THE DATE ON WHICH THE U.S. SOUTHERN DISTRICT COURT; HOUSTON DIVISION DECIDED MY CASE WAS; OCTOBER 31, 2021. SEE APPENDIX "A".

THE JURISDICTION OF THIS COURT IS INVOLVED UNDER 28 U.S.C. SEC. 1257(2).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

FIRST AMENDMENT; Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or ~~prohibiting~~ 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.

FOURTEENTH; 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.

SIXTH; In all criminal prosecutions a defendant shall enjoy the "right" to compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor.

FIFTH; A person shall not be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of the law.

ATTACHMENT TO STATEMENT

THIS CASE IS ABOUT THE COVER-UPS OF THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM TO HIDE REPUBLICAN PARTY COLLUSION CRIMES AND FALSELY IMPRISON WHISTLEBLOWERS EXPOSING THEM.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT COURT JUDGE; KENNETH M. MOYT COVERS-UP FOR HIS CO-WORKER AND FRIEND UNETHICALLY IN CASE NO. 4:22-CV-00081 AND IS PILED ON HIMSELF FOR HIS COVER-UP AND LIES IN THIS CASE, AS WELL AS CASE NO. USCA5#19-20717 WHICH IS THE MAIN CASE FOR WHICH ALL THEIR COVER-UPS ORIGINATE. THIS CONSPIRACY TO COVER-UP REPUBLICAN PARTY COLLUSION AND BACKTREADING, FALSE IMPRISONMENT ETC. IS NOW A NATIONAL CONSPIRACY WITH THE U.S. SUPREME COURT AND FIFTH CIRCUIT INVOLVEMENTS.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

THIS CASE LIKE ALL U.S. SOUTHERN DISTRICT CASE Z'VE FILED SINCE 2014, IS A PREDICATE ACT IN ASSOCIATION WITH THE REPUBLICAN PARTIES COVER-UPS FOR RICK PERRY IN 2012 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION WHEN HE WAS GIVING PROTECTIONS ILLEGALLY TO HOUSTON, TEXAS BILLION DOLLAR CORPORATIONS; BAYLOR COLLEGE OF MEDICINE AND TEXAS CHILDREN'S HOSPITALS, OFFERING PROTECTIONS FROM THEIR CRIMES AND LIABILITIES IN EXCHANGE FOR POLITICAL FUNDINGS.

I.

THESE RACKETEERING AND COLLUSION CRIMES ARE PROVEN BY THE EVIDENCE IN FIFTH CIRCUIT CASE NO. 19-20717, NOWY BEING CONTINUOUSLY COVERED-UP BY REPUBLICANS

IN THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT COURT, FIFTY
CIRCUIT AND SUPREME COURT.

II.

EVIDENCE PROVES I WAS IMPRISONED AS AN
INNOCENT MAN, FOR BEING A WHISTLE-
BLOWER EXPOSING THE FABRICATION OF
MY SON'S MEDICAL RECORDS AT TEXAS CHILD-
RENS HOSPITAL BY BAYLOR EMPLOYEES
WHO THEN PAID THEM TO ~~THE~~ MY
WIFE'S LAWYERS AFTER CONSPIRATORIAL
MEETINGS TO DO THE SAME AND DECEIVED
A U.S. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE INTO BE-
LEAVING IT TRUE.

III.

SAID CORPORATIONS FUNDING RICK PERRY
SOUGHT PROTECT. THESE HOUSTON, TEXAS
BASED CORPORATIONS BRIBING SENIOR

SOUTHERN DISTRICT JUDGE; DAVID HITTNER,
IGNORED MY ACTUAL INNOCENCE, CONSTITU-
TIONAL RIGHTS DEPRIVATIONS WHEREIN I
WAS REFUSED:

1. ALL DEFENSE WITNESSES
2. ALL EVIDENCE SUBMITTALS
3. ALL MOTIONS WERE DENIED
4. ALL DISCOVERY WAS DENIED
5. THE COURT REPORTER DELETED OFFICIAL
COURT TRANSCRIPTS.
6. THE JUDGE (LISA MICHAEL) APPT. CORRUPT
COUNSEL TO STOP ME EXPOSING THEIR
COVER-UP.
7. IT WAS AN UNFAIR ~~THE~~ TRIBUNAL BEFORE
A PREJUDICE JUDGE, WHO COULD GAIN
FOR HER COVER-UPS.
8. SHE MADE ALL DEFENSE JURY STRIKES
ETC. ETC. THE U.S. SOUTHERN DISTRICT
COURT NOW FULLY BACKS THIS COVER-UP

BY APPOINTING CORRUPT JUDGES TO IGNORE
THE "RELATIONSHIP" BETWEEN CASE NO.
19-20717 AND ALL CIVIC ACTIONS FILED
TO COMPLAIN ABOUT THEIR CONTINUED
COVER-UPS.

IV.

JUDGE; NANCY F. ATLAS IMPOSED ~~SAC~~
SANCTIONS AND THE THREE-STRIKE RULE
TO THWART MY EFFORTS TO EXPOSE
THEIR COVER-UPS AND CONSPIRACY.
MANY OF THESE JUDGES ARE LISTED
BELOW:

1. JEFFREY BRODY
 2. DAVID MITTNER
 3. NANCY F. ATLAS
 4. SIM LAKE
 5. GEORGE C. HANKS
 6. KEITH P. ELLISON
 7. LEE M. ROSENTHAL
 8. LYNN N. HUGHES
 9. ALFRED M. BENNETT
 10. CHARLES ESKRIDGE
 11. KENNETH M. HOYT
- 7.

V.

ALL THESE JUDGES COVER UP BY CITING
INAPPROPRIATE PRISON LITIGATION REFORM
ACT (P.L.R.A.) LAWF. "THEY ALL SAY" THAT
JUSTICE; NANCY F. ATLAS "THREE-STRIKE"
ORDER APPLIES TO THEIR COVER-UPS FOR
MY FREEDOM OF SPEECH; FIRST AMEND-
MENT RIGHT.

VI.

SEE: PRISON LITIGATION HANDBOOK, SEC.
14.6.1., QUOTING THE NINTH CIRCUIT
COURT OF APPEALS AS STATING: THAT
"DEPRIVATIONS" OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT
DO NOT APPLY TO THE "THREE-STRIKE"
PROVISION, YET ALL THE ABOVE MENTIONED
JUDGES OF THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT ARE
IGNORING THE NINTH ~~CIRCUIT~~ CIRCUITS

RULE, BECAUSE THEY ARE ALL IN ON THE SAME POLITICAL COVER-UP AND THIS IS THE CASE IN THE REPUBLICAN SUPREME COURT AS WELL. HOWEVER NO MATTER HOW MANY CORRUPT JUDGES JOIN THE PARTIES COVER-UP, THEY ALL AVAIL THE SAME FEDERAL INVESTIGATORS, AS IT IS ILLEGAL TO CONSPIRE BY JUDICIAL NEGLECT OR OTHERWISE AND IMPRISON INNOCENT AMERICAN CITIZENS FOR EXPOSING POLITICAL CRIMES.

VII:

THE U.S. CONSTITUTION PROTECTS AMERICANS IN SEVERAL LAWS FROM JUDICIAL BIAS, IT MUST BE SAID THAT MANY OF TODAY'S JUDGES SIMPLY BELIEVE TAKING BRIBES IS PART OF THEIR BENEFITS.

THE ONLY WAY TO COMBAT THIS
TYPE CORRUPTION IS THROUGH THE MED-
IAS INFORMING THE PEOPLE THEIR
GOVERNMENT IS SELLING THEM OUT.

UTL

MARSHALL VS. JARRICO ZINC, 446 U.S. 238
64 L. ED. 182 100 S. CT. 1610 (1980), DUE
PROCESS CLAUSE ENTITLES PERSONS TO AN
IMPARTIAL AND DISINTERESTED TRIBUNAL
IN BOTH "CIVIL" AND "FEDERAL CASES".

IX.

NOT ONLY WAS IT "UNEETHICAL" FOR
KENNETH MOYT TO PRESIDE OVER HIS
OWN CO-WORKER AND FRIEND AT THE
SOUTHERN DISTRICT COURTHOUSE, BUT HE'S
NOT A DISINTERESTED PARTY, ESPECIALLY

LY SINCE HE'S A REPUBLICAN, OR SHOULD
WE KEEP PRETENDING FOR THE SAKE
OF THEIR COVER-UPS THIS IS ALL ABOUT
THE THREE-STRIKE RULE? THE EVIDENCE
COMPILED SINCE THIS COVER-UP START-
ED IN 2012 DURING GOV. PERRY'S PRES-
IDENTIAL ELECTION PROVES MANY
TIMES OVER THAT ~~THE~~ THE COVER-UPS
NEVER STOPPED, ESPECIALLY SINCE ALL
Z'VE DONE IN THOSE (10) TEN YEARS
WAS TO EXPOSE IT....

X.

CONSPIRACY IS DEFINED AS: WHEN TWO
(2) OR MORE PEOPLE BY 'CONCERTED ACTION'
TO ACCOMPLISH AN UNLAWFUL ACT. (COVER
UP) IN THIS CASE. EVERY JUDGE IN TEXAS,
A 'REPUBLICAN STATE' ILLEGALLY COVERED

- UP MY INNOCENCE; CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS DEPRIVATIONS; FALSE IMPRISONMENT OR A WHISTLE ~~A~~ BLOWER PROTECTING HIS SON FROM MEDICAL RECORDS FRAUD AND ABDUCTION BY CONSPIRACY. THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT COURT JUDGES ALL KNEW AND WILLFULLY COMMITTED TO THEIR COVER-UPS TO PROTECT THEIR PARTY OR FOR BRIBES FROM BAYLOR WHO HAS SPENT MILLIONS TO KEEP THEIR CRIMES COVERED-UP.

XI

WHEN THE RESPONDENT COVERED-UP FOR DAVID MITTNER (HIS FRIEND) HE DID SO UNETHICALLY AND UNCONSTITUTIONALLY ~~WHAT~~ WITH THE INTENT TO COMMIT CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND CONTINUE

THEIR GOAL TO TAKE BRIBES AND
STOP MY EXPOSING THIS POLITICAL
COVER-UP TO PROTECT GREGG ABBOTT
THE GOVERNOR OF TEXAS NOW; WHO IN
2012 WAS RICK PERRY'S ATTORNEY GEN-
ERAL AND TOLD THE MONTGOMERY
COUNTY COURTHOUSE TO ILLEGALLY
HAVE ME WRONGFULLY IMPRISONED,
AS MY YOUTUBE VIDEOS CALLING RICK
PERRY A CHILD MOLESTER IN 2012
RUINED HIS CHANCE AND TEXAS FROM
HAVING ANOTHER TEXAS PRESIDENT
TO LINE THEIR POCKETS. WELL NO
MATTER PERRY WAS OUT IN A BLINK
FOR HIS NATURAL CORRUPT NATURE.

XII:

THE IDEA IS TO GIVE ME (35) ONE
YEAR SET-OFF'S ON PAROLE, AND HAVE

WE DIE IN PRISON, AN INNOCENT
MAN, TO PROTECT SCUM LIKE GREGG
ABBOTT AND KEN PAXTON WHO NEED
THESE CORPORATIONS "FUNDINGS". HENCE
~~WHY~~ ~~WHATEX~~ THE PARTIES JUDGES LIKE FIFTH
CIRCUIT, HOUSTON, TEXAS JUDGE; GREGG
ACOSTA AND HITNER BOTH OVER
LOOKED MY INNOCENCE AND DENIAL
OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS AS WELL
AS THESE CORPORATIONS CRIMES.

XIII

THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT
EVEN SHUTS THEIR DOOR TO FILING
MY CASE; NO. USCA5#19-20717 BE-
CAUSE OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY MAJ-
ORITY.

XV:

ALL THE SUPREME COURT JUSTICES HAVE
RECEIVED CORRESPONDENCES FROM ME,
AND AMY CONEY BARRITT RECEIVES
WEEKLY LETTERS, THEY STAY SILENT
IN THEIR UNITY TO PROTECT THEIR
POLITICAL PARTY AND IMPRISON THOSE
WHO DON'T AGREE WITH THEM...

XV:

THE NEUTRALITY REQUIREMENT HELP TO
GUARANTEE THAT LIFE, LIBERTY OR PRO-
PERTY WILL NOT BE TAKEN ON THE
BASIS OF AN ERRONEOUS OR DISTORTED
CONCEPTION OF THE FACTS, OF LAW.

SEE: MATHEW VS. ELDRIDGE; 424 U.S.

319, 344, 96 S. CT. 893, 907 (1976).

HURLS VS. RYAN; 706 P. 3d 1021

(CA9 2013) DUE PROCESS CLAUSE OF THE
FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT ESTABLISHES A
CONSTITUTIONAL FLOOR, NOT A UNIFORM STA-
NDARD FOR JUDICIAL BIAS CLAIM.

BRACY VS. GRAMLEY; 526 U.S. 899, 904, 117
S. CT. 1793, 138 L. ED. 2d 97 (1997). WHILE
MOST CLAIMS OF JUDICIAL BIAS ARE RESOLVED
BY COMMON LAW STATUTE OR THE PROFESSIO-
NAL STANDARDS OF THE BENCH AND BAR,
THE FLOOR ESTABLISHED BY DUE PROCESS
CLAUSE CLEARLY REQUIRES A FAIR TRIAL
IN A FAIR TRIBUNAL BEFORE A JUDGE
WITH NO ACTUAL BIAS AGAINST THE DEF-
ENDANT OR "INTERESTS IN THE OUTCOME"
OF HIS PARTICULAR CASE. 2d. at 904-05, 117
S. CT. 1793 QUOTING WHITHROW VS. LARKIN,
421 U.S. 35, 46, 95 S. CT. 1456, 43 L.
ED. 2d. (1975)

XVI.

THE CONSTITUTION REQUIRE RECUSAL WHEN THE PROBABILITY OR ACTUAL BIAS ON THE PART OF A JUDGE OR DECISION MAKER IS TOO HIGH TO BE CONSTITUTIONALLY TOLLERABLE. WITHROVY, 421 U.S. 214, 47, 95 S. CT. 1456. MURLES NEED NOT PROVE ACTUAL BIAS TO ESTABLISH A DUE PROCESS VIOLATION, JUST AN INTOLERABLE RISK OF BIAS.

XVII.

AETNA LIFE CO. VS. LAVOIR; 475 U.S. 813, 106 S. CT. 1580 89 L. ED. 2d 823 (1986). SEE ALSO CARPENTON, 556 U.S. 21 ~~883~~⁸⁸³ 129 S. CT. 2252 [THE DUE PROCESS CLAUSE HAS BEEN IMPLIMENTED BY OBJECTIVE STANDARDS THAT DO NOT

REQUIRE PROOF OF ACTUAL BIAS, THUS WE
WE MUST ASK WHETHER UNDER "A REAL-
ISTIC APPRISAL" OR PSYCHOLOGICAL TEND-
ENCIES AND HUMAN WEAKNESSES, THE
JUDGE'S INTERESTS POSE SUCH A RISK
OR ACTUAL BIAS OR PREJUDGEMENT
THAT THE PRACTICE MUST BE FORBIDDEN
IF THE GUARANTEE OF OUR PROCESS IS
TO BE ADEQUATELY IMPLEMENTED.

XVIII:

CONSIDERING THAT THIS CRIMINAL CONSPIR-
ACY HAS CONTINUED FROM 2012 THRU THIS
DAY NOW IN 2022, TEN (10) YEARS AND
ALL THE COURTS TO THE SUPREME COURT
ARE PARTICIPATING IN WRONGFULLY IMP-
RISONING INNOCENT AMERICAN WHISTLE-
BLOWERS PROTECTING THEIR CHILDREN

A FEDERAL INVESTIGATION MUST BE
IMPLIMENTED TO PROTECT OUR DEMO-
CRACY,

~~THE~~

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY SHOULD NOT BE
~~BE~~ ALLOWED TO SELL OUT THE AMERICAN
PEOPLE FOR CORPORATE BRIBES AND POLIT-
ICAL FUNDINGS, BUT THAT APPAR IN WHAT
ARE COURTS NOW RELY ON, WAGGING THEIR
TAILS EVERY TIME A CORPORATE ATTORNEY
ENTERS THEIR COURT ROOM. THE NATIONS
HIGHEST COURT IS NOW SELLING OUT THE
PEOPLE TO PROTECT THEIR REPUBLICAN
PARTY. JUST AS SOON AS THE JUDGES AND
POLITICIANS FOUND OUT THAT THESE CORP-
ORATIONS WERE WILLING TO PAY THEM
"BRIBES" ANY FAIR TRIBUNAL WENT

OUT THE VIKING AND THE SUPREME COURT CLOSED THEIR DOORS AND STOPPED ALL COMMUNICATIONS, TAKING MY THREE-HUNDRED (\$300.00) DOLLAR FILING FEE FOR MY CRIMINAL CASE, NO. USCA 5 #19-20717 WITH THEM.

RELIEF

RELIEF OF THREE-HUNDRED MILLION DOLLARS (\$300,000,000.00) FOR CONSPIRACY TO IMPRISON INNOCENT AMERICAN'S EXPOSING REPUBLICAN PARTY CRIMES AND DAMAGES INCURRED TO THE PLAINTIFF'S LIFE, CHILDREN AND SPOUSE, THEFT OF HIS PROPERTY IS NOT ASKING MUCH. RELIEF SHOULD BE GRANTED FOR

CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

Michael G. Petru - PETITIONER

FEBRUARY 9TH, 2022

REASONS FOR GRANTING PETITION

1. FAIRNESS OF JUSTICE
2. CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY
3. FALSE IMPRISONMENT
4. TAKING OF BRIBES TO COVER-UP CORP-ORATE CRIMES.
5. COLLUSION
6. RACKETEERING
7. CRONIZUM
8. FEDERAL INVESTIGATORS...
9. ~~DEMO~~ DEMOCRACY
10. THE CONSTITUTION
11. BILL OF RIGHTS
12. WATERGATE...

CONCLUSION

THE TRUTH HURTS, THE EVIDENCE PROVES
THE COVER-UPS... AND NO ONE WILL NEVER
GIVE-UP EXPOSING THE CRIMES THAT
STOLE MY SON FROM ME ILLEGALLY. CON-
SIDER THIS A SETTLEMENT OFFER, WITH
RECONCILIATION AND NEW IDENTIFICATION.

THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF HABEAS
CORPUS SHOULD BE GRANTED.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

Michael G. Patten

February 9, 2022