	· :
	No
	,
	ALTHE
	IN THE
•	SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
	SUPREMIE COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
V	
_	JEFFREY E. AKARD — PETITIONER
	<u>Jeffrey E. AKARD</u> — PETITIONER (Your Name)
	vs.
	Deale M. Deale L. Bropoupting
	Denis McDonough — RESPONDENT(S) Sec. of Veteran's Affairs
	ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO
. United S	States Court of Appeals For the Federal Circuit
(NAME OF	COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)
•	PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
	T 11/100 + 1001-1
	JEFFrey E. AKARD #199176
	(Your Name)
	1000 Van Nuys Rd. (Address)
•	(Address)
	RECEIVED
	New Castle IN 47362-9060 APR - 5 2022
	7 2022
	(City, State, Zip Code) OFFICE OF THE CLERK SUPREME COURT, U.S.
•	N/A
	(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

Does a disabled veteran have a "personal stake,
interest, or standing" on seeing that his withheld 20%
benefit, due to his incarceration, receive a special apportionent
to be sent to his SSA disabled Futher?
IF this disabled veteran had a wife, child, and a
disabled Father, wouldn't the veteran File For whom It goes
to and be the person to File appeals For his apportionment
dacisia ?
decision?
When a veteran's Withheld 20% benefit's dollar amount
permonth is not enough money For the veteran's Father, or
per Month 15 110+ enough indirect 100 till be les the shall
anyone, to obtain "dependant" status, then shouldn't
the Veteran be the party to File For Special apportionner

LIST OF PARTIES

· ·		

·		
	•	
	 <u> </u>	
, : 		
-		

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	4
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	5
CONCLUSION	6
INDEX TO APPENDICES	
APPENDIX A 2021-1383 U.S. Ct. of Appeals For the Federal Circ Dec. 13, 2021 and Mandate Feb. 17, 2022 APPENDIX B 19-6262 U.S. Ct. of Appeals For Veteran's Cl Decision Aug. 27, 2020; Appellant's Informal APPENDIX C 18-38 490A Board of Veterans Appeals Order	'wins Memorandu Brief
APPENDIX C	
APPENDIX D 345/216/AAA Dept. of VA Decision June 12, 2	
APPENDIX E	
APPENDIX F	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
AKard v. McDonough, 2021 U.S. App. Lexis 36633 2021 WL.	5876031 5
Belton v. Principi, 17 Vet. App. 209, 211 (2003)	5
Ferenc v. Nicholson, 20 Vet. App. 58, 64 (2006)	5
Fuller V. Mc Donough, 2022 U.S. App. Vet. Claims Lexis	244 5
Redding v. West, 13 Vet. App. 512, 514 (2000)	5
Shipwash v Brown, 8 Vet. 218, 227 (1995)	. 6
STATUTES AND RULES	
38 CFR \$ 3,102 - Reasonable doubt	5
38 CFR \$ 3.451 - Speial Apportionment	3,5
38 CFR \$ 3,665(e)(1) - Apportionment	5
38 CFR & 5313 - Compensation	3,5
38 USCS \$ 7101-13 - Board of Vet. App.	5
	·
OTHER	
VA Form 21P. 509 Statement of Dependant Parent	5,
(VCAA) Veteran's Claim Assistance Act of 2000	

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTRIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

OPINIONS BELOW

[v] For cases from Federal Courts:	. · .
The opinion of the United States Courts of Appeals appears in Append	ix
[/] reported at <u>2021-1383</u> <u>2021 WL 587603</u> Lexis 36633 [] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or, [] is unpublished.	
Veterm's Claims The opinion of the United States District Court appears at Appendix _ to the petition and is	В
[] reported at	; or,
[] 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,
The opinion of the court ap Appendix to the petition and is	pears at
[] reported at	; or,

JURISDICTION

[] For cases from federal courts:
The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was 12/13/2021, Mandale Feb. 03, 2022. Appx. A
[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 NoA
The jurisdiction of the Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. §1254(1).
[] For cases from the 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
Appendix NoA
The jurisdiction of the Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. §1257(a).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Fifth and Fourteenth Amend. due process rights violated
to a state incarcerated pro-se patitioner's brief not consid-
ered by 38 CFR & 3.451 Special Apportionment, states in part,
"Without regard to any other provision regarding
apportionment where hardship is shown to exist
may be specially apportioned. In determining the
basis For special apportionment, consideration will
be given such as factor as: Amount of Department
of Veterans Affairs benefits payable; apportionment
of less than 20 percent of his or her benefits would
not provide a reasonable amount For any apportionee."
Where appeals are devied on apportionment, not special apportionment,
veteran's Father proof of SSA disability, and 20% is requested.
Dependant status to deny claims violates due process by the 10%
current benefit cannot make him my dependent, nor 203 benefit
requested would not be enough money to claim dependent. So,
STOP desing a "Special Apportionment" For those reasons.
Eighth Amend. Cruel and Unusual Punishment violations by
Use of, incarcerated veteran does not have a Personal Stake,
Interest, or Standing" in the appeal. However, due to Incarceration
the VA 38 CFR 95313 reduces my VA disability benefit to 10%
and then With holds the 20% benefit as punishment ontop of
My sentence. Further not allowing this 20% benefit to be sent to my disabled Futher Is a third additional 8th Amend. Violation.
My disabled Futher 1s a third additional 8th Amend. Violation.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Petittoner appeals cause 2021-1383 Dec. 13, 2021, devial
OF Special apportionment to Veteran's disabled Father by
United States Court of Appeals For the Federal Circult and
thier Feb. 03, 2022, Mandate issuing a Final judgment as
Feb. 17, 2022. Appx. A.
Jeffrey E. Akard, pro-se, a serviced-connected honorubly
discharged From Full-enlistment 30% disabled Veteran, is
presently incurcerated with suppressed actual insocence evid,
not adjudicated on the Merits of Const. Violations. Veteran's
disability compensation was reduced by 38 CFR & 5313 From
30% to 10% in June 2009. In 2013 Akard learned his
Father was awarded Full SSA disability and that a VA
38 CFR & 3,451 Special Apportionment existed.
In May 2018, VA deried apportionment request. Appx. D.
In June 2019, VA Board dismissed appeal, Appx C
.In Aug. 2020, Ct. Veteran's Claims affirmed Board. Appx. B.
In Dek, 2021, Ct. Fed. Cir. App. affirmed Vet. Ct. Appx A.
In Feb 2022, Ct. Fed. Cir. App. Ussued Final Judgment. Appx A.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Petitioner's "Personal stake, interest, and standing" in the outcome of this controversy is being able to reach out From behind these prison walls to provide some assistance Formy disabled Father, by support From a 20% VA benefit 'Special Apportionment pursuant 38 CFR & 3,451. I ask the Justices to not condemn my Father due to my incarceration or on the blanket use of Belton, Ferenc, or Redding's "typically" reasons. The Board and appeals courts offer a 'catch 22' by saying, 1) Veteran presents no support payments being sent to parent, From his current reduced 10% benefit per 38 CFR \$5313; and 2) reteran's Father IS not his dependant, even though the bare MINIMUM amount of 20% (Key Factor for apportionment & 3.1665(eXI)) is not enough money (10% or 20%) to make anyone a dependant; 3) in VA Form 21P. 509 15 based on 30% or higher benefit and 38 USCS 7101-13 is most when veteran's Father cannot be a "dependant" living OFF OF available 20% benefit requested. Therefore, Filing and appeal process rests with the veteran to get a Special Apportionment granted since the Father can't apply The burden of "hardship is shown to exist "in \$ 3,451 and VCAA 2000, by proof in his Father's 2009 SSA Notice of Award of disability, showing a 38 CFR 3.102 Reasonable doubt in lower court's decision that should be resolved in Favor of clalmant. Recently in Akard V. McDonough, 2021 U.S. App. Lexis 36633, Courts are using reasoning in my case (non precedential) not binding but a "AKard definition" in Foller v. McDonoush, 2022 U.S. Vet. Class Lexis 244 No. 18-7000, Is quarted in Opinion and Dissent "Akard tracked the statute providing For the people who may appeal. " See ante at 14 n. 10. IF veteran had a wife or child, this

Would be simple, but this is an "unusual IF not exceptional circumst."

to grant special apportionment decision in veteran's Favor, and

ultimately his Father's Favor. see Shipwash v. Brown, 8 Vet. 218[1995].

Veteran Akard was sentenced in 2009, but these desials

comount to additional punishment to his prison sentence

where he could relieve some hardships From his Father,

with this 'bare minimum' 20% benefit special apportionment

Since he cannot be there in person to help him out.

Therefore, no court adjudicated merits of FIFth, Eighth, or

Fourteenth Amend viol. Using 38 CFR & 3.451 Special Apportionments'

guidence, shown on p. 3, that provides this 20% benefit may

relieve hardship For veteran's Father's SSA disabilities.

CONCLUSION

The petition for writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully Submitted,

Potitioner, pro se

Teffrey E. AWARD #199176 (PRINTED NAME

Date: March 11, 2022

1060 Van Nuys Rd. New Castle IN 47362-9060