

22-5101

No. _____

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

FILED

JUL 11 2022

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

ORIGINAL

Sonya Owens

Petitioner,

v.

Reliance Group, LLC

Respondent,

Nicole Saharsky

Amicus Curiae.

On Writ of Certiorari to the
U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Sonya Owens

Sonya Owens, Pro Se
1325 Ingraham St NW
Washington, D.C. 20011
(202) 709-9193
sonyaowens@hotmail.com
(For Court purposes only)

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- (1) Does Congress or the President have authority to change or amend the Constitution without ratification of $\frac{2}{3}$ of the States' Legislatures?
- (2) Are the personal and property rights of the petitioner granted by the federal government protected by the Supremacy Clause or Bill of Rights in the U.S. Constitution?
- (3) Are writs of eviction required to adhere to the 4th Amendment?
- (4) Did the courts abuse its discretion or err by not adhering to Courts or other Government "stay-at-home" orders declared by the U.S. President, U.S. Congress, State or Local Government?
 - a. Do U.S. citizens retain their substantive rights under "stay-at-home" orders tolling the computation of time requirements, access to the courts, or due process in the courts?

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS

All parties to the proceedings are listed on the case captions.

RELATED CASES

U.S. District Court Case No. 19-2491

U.S. Bankruptcy Court Case No. 19-489

D.C. Court of Appeals Case No. 19-647

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | PAGE |
|---|-------------|
| QUESTIONS PRESENTED | 1 |
| PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS | 2 |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | 3 |
| OPINIONS BELOW | 4 |
| JURISDICTION | 5 |
| CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED | 5 |
| STATEMENT OF THE CASE | 6 |
| REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION | 10 |
| CONCLUSION | 11 |
| APPENDIX A | A-1 |
| APPENDIX B | B-1 |

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A – Order Denying Rehearing, dated 4-11-22

APPENDIX B – Order Denying Rehearing En Banc, dated 4-11-22

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner prays that the writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below,

OPINIONS BELOW

For cases from the Federal courts:

- The opinion of the United States Court of Appeals appears as Appendix A to the petition and is not published.

JURISDICTION

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. §1254(1), 28 U.S.C. §2072, and 28 U.S.C. §1251. This Court has jurisdiction to review the State cases under 28 U.S.C. §1257(a).

For cases from federal courts:

The U.S. Court of Appeals decided my case on 3-11-2022. A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the U.S. Court of Appeals on 4-11-2022, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears as Appendix A.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY (PROVISIONS INVOLVED)

Article III, Section 1

Article V

Article VI, Clause 2

Preamble of the Bill of Rights

First Amendment

Second Amendment

Fourth Amendment

Fifth Amendment

Seventh Amendment

Thirteenth Amendment

Fourteenth Amendment

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This matter arises through the lower courts in the District of Columbia, a federal district, and residence of the United States Government. The petitioner, Sonya Owens, is a Black American U.S. citizen by birth (of African-, Native American-, and British descent) defending her personal and real property rights specifically granted to her by the United States Government in a written Deed, under an Act of Congress. There is no dispute about the authenticity of the documents filed by the United States Government in the D.C. Recorder of Deeds Office. There is no dispute the written Deed grants property rights, which makes the petitioner an original D.C. resident of equal standing as the local government. She disputes all claims by the Respondent as frivolous.

Ms. Owens has legal standing to dispute the local government's pursuit of Statehood, as an unconstitutional violation of her property rights and the sovereignty of the U.S. Government or Supremacy Clause. She challenges an act of Congress titled "Washington D.C. Admission Act" or "H.R. 51 – 117th Congress (2021-2022)" as unconstitutional. At least H.R. 51, Section 113 "Retention of Title to Property" contradicts itself. It is not possible for both, the U.S. Government and D.C. local government to "have and retain title to, or jurisdiction over" the same real and personal property. The U.S. Constitution does not grant authority to U.S. Congress nor the President of the United States, to change or amend it. As written in the unabridged Preamble to the Bill of Rights, Congress, alone, may propose changes – which must be approved by ratification of three-quarters of the States'

Legislatures, under Article V, of the U.S. Constitution. This also means, President Polk did not have authority to return the City of Alexandria (originally and permanently ceded as part of the District of Columbia) to the State of Virginia. At least 26 States have already sent letters to the President opposing this congressional act. The Washington D.C. Act, which the President is ready to sign as law, imminently threatens to reduce the land area of the federal government to create land to form a 51st State. It will seize federal U.S. Government property and give it to the local D.C. government to become a 51st State. It contradicts the U.S. Constitution, the Organic and Residency Acts. Meanwhile, Puerto Rico and other outlying territories of the United States, who already have their land to become a State, moreso than Washington, D.C. will continue to be denied Statehood. The old rallying cry that D.C. residents want Statehood is not verified and should not be determined as persuasive. Today, approximately 85% of the people who live in Washington, D.C. were not born or raised in the federal District; less than 8% of D.C. residents are Black Americans.

The petitioner challenged the jurisdiction of the local courts from inception, as unconstitutional, before they seized possession her property and U.S. Government property, then giving it to the Respondent (a private entity) who filed concurrent Landlord/Tenant and civil actions, without any proof of claim. In fact, his complaints were not signed by a licensed attorney. There has not been any landlord/tenant relationship or other communication, between the petitioner and respondent. While both cases were removed to U.S. District Court, plaintiff

filed a Chapter 11 bankruptcy petition that was instantly dismissed before it was completed. Then, on its own, Bankruptcy Court vacated its earlier decision for sufficient minutes to deny her from ever filing bankruptcy again, involving her property, “for the sole purpose of allowing the Landlord/Tenant court’s eviction to proceed.” When the court’s typing ended, they dismissed the bankruptcy case again. The U.S. Marshals executed an outdated, unsigned writ of eviction. The writ, eviction, and proceedings of the Landlord/Tenant Court all occurred knowingly by the local court, while the case was removed to U.S. District Court. ‘Removed to US District Court’ is docketed about 4 times on the court record. There is no dispute the petitioner is a homeowner who paid-off her mortgage loan (which the written Deed with the U.S. Government, granted her permission to obtain). The Note-holder filed notarized affidavits in the Recorder of Deeds Office. There is not a contract, whatsoever, between the petitioner and the respondent.

On a timely filed appeal from Bankruptcy Court, District Court reviewed the matter based on an admittedly incomplete record, while the nation and the courts were closed by orders to immediately stay-at-home because of Covid-19. The petitioner had filed two motions in District Court requesting approval to efile using CM/ECF. She provided an email address explaining this was the best way to notify her. It makes sense that after the bankruptcy court helped the local court to evict her from home – she could not receive mail. She was homeless. But, District Court denied both motions in its entirety and ordered the clerk to send notifications, by registered mail to her home. Plus, there is no one to deliver mail while everyone is

ordered to stay-at-home. In addition, District Courts' Covid-19 Orders stated all civil actions were stayed until further notice. The courts promised all parties in civil actions would receive written notice of any changes in the status of their cases, in more than sufficient time to act without losing their rights. This protocol did not happen for Ms. Owens. She filed a Writ of Coram Nobis to keep her rights to appeal.

On a timely appeal to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, the petitioner was granted CM/ECF filing privileges. Her request for an attorney was denied; stating she is capable of representing herself. Later, she received favorable court rulings in both, D.C. Court of Appeals and U.S. Court of Appeals, each deciding summary judgment was not appropriate. The petitioner's relevant appeal was put on the calendar for oral arguments before a three-Judge panel in both Appellate Courts. However, in U.S. Court of Appeal, one week before the oral proceeding, her case was removed. The procedures and practices of the courts state 'all pro se and indigent civil cases are automatically diverted from Judges.' In other words, no Judge reviews or decides these type of cases. It violates Ms. Owens' Seventh Amendment right to a trial by jury; First-, Fourth-, Fifth-, Thirteenth, and Fourteenth Amendments rights too. However, U.S. Court of Appeals' final decision states two panel Judges participated. The rules require unanimous participation.

Ms. Owens continues her appeal(s) challenging the jurisdiction and decisions of the Bankruptcy Court, District Court, and U.S. Court of Appeals, as well as the decisions of the State Courts. D.C. State Courts are bound by legislation to follow federal court rules and procedures. The petitioner was

approved for electronic filing in the State courts. Since October 2021, D.C. Appeals Court has not issued any final decision in her related case. She has not been notified of any recent activity on her appeal. Only the U.S. Supreme Court can issue a writ of mandamus to D.C. Appeals Court. Therefore, Ms. Owens includes by reference, a demand to issue a writ of mandamus to D.C. Court of Appeals, so the U.S. Supreme Court may conserve its resources and review all the related issues at one time.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

This petition raises constitutional issues or questions that were not addressed by the lower courts. The questions presented have not been addressed by the U.S. Supreme Court or there is not consistency among the lower courts. For example, D.C. Statehood may have been reviewed by the Court for public federal land rights, but not considered for private federal land rights. [Local D.C. Government settled its dispute with Howard University]. The States, might not have legal standing to oppose D.C. Statehood, without the Court's consideration of the full Preamble in the Bill of Rights. The petitioner has an active written Deed in her name, stating all property at her residence belongs to and is signed by the U.S. Government. This private federal government property was seized by the courts, given to a private person, without due process or even allowing her to speak. Do the courts deny constitutional guarantees by automatically diverting all cases away from Judges, filed by certain people?

These events are not anomalies. They are precursors of injustice given to every poor person, without a lawyer, who appears in court.

Not everyone has the ability or desire to be pro se attorney like Roger Sherman. He is a Founding Father without formal education; the only person who signed all four most important documents. He is a member of the Committee of Five who wrote the Declaration of Independence. Pro Se ["attorneys"] have a fundamental place in our country and judicial system. Roger Sherman Baldwin, his grandson, and former President John Quincy Adams, successfully defended the private property rights of Africans (of the Amistad), against a sitting U.S. President and Spain, many years before the Emancipation Proclamation.

The United States Government does not lose property rights to any State, territory, or person and neither should their property entrusted to the petitioner.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Sonya Owens
Sonya Owens

July 11, 2022