

NO. 22-20166

IN THE

22-5300
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

MICHAEL GEOFFREY PETERS, PETITIONER

VS.

ANDREW S. MANEN, RESPONDENT

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

U.S. FIFTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI



MICHAEL GEOFFREY PETERS

STRINGSFELLOW UNIT

1200 FM 655

RUSHARON, TEXAS 77583

(281) 595-3413



QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1. IS IT LEGAL AND OR CONSTITUTIONAL FOR THE LOWER COURTS TO USE THE "THREE-STRIKES" PROVISION AS A WEAPON TO SILENCE ONE'S FREE-SPEECH EXP. OSING THE GOVERNMENTS; ('POLITICAL, JUDICIAL AND CORPORATE RACKETEERING AND COLLUSION CRIMES')?
2. IS IT LAWFUL TO IMPOSE "SANCTIONS" TO "RETRIBUTE" AGAINST WHISTLE-BLOWERS EXPOSING JUDICIAL CORRUPTION?
3. IS IT LAWFUL FOR ONE'S "CRONIES" TO PRESIDE OVER EACH OTHERS CIVIL CASES AND DISMISS THEM WITHOUT AND INVESTIGATIONS INTO THE FACTS AND CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE CASE?

4. IS IT LEGAL TO IMPOSE SENTENCES
~~WHEN~~ WHEN A CASE HAS MERIT?

5. DO FEDERAL JUDGES HAVE THE RIGHT
TO TAKE BRIBES FROM LOCAL BILLION
DOLLAR CORPORATIONS TO COVER-UP AND
GIVE THEM PROTECTION FROM THEIR
CRIMES AND LIABILITIES?

LIST OF PARTIES

THE LIST OF PARTIES CAN BE SEEN THROUGH-OUT ALL THE RELATED CASES BELOW, AS THEY ARE DIRECTLY RELATED TO THE GOVERNMENTS COVER-UPS FOR; (i) POLITICAL, JUDICIAL AND CORPORATE RACKETEERING AND COLLUSION CRIMES, CHILD ABDUCTION, FALSE IMPRISONMENT ETC. THIS CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY BY THE JUDICIARY AND THE CORPORATIONS THEY PROTECT IS NOW TEN (10) YEARS OLD, AND CONTINUING.

RELATED CASES

SUPREME COURT CASES:

- 21-7795- Corrupt Appl. Defense Counsel
- 21-20371- Fed. Judge Defacing Appeal
- 21-40819- Selective Prosecution
- 21-7966- Fed. Judge cover-ups.

22-20059-	"	"
22-20180-	"	"
22-20082-	"	"
22-20135-	"	"
21-7747-	"	"
21-20601-	"	"
21-7747-	"	"
21-7818-	Cruel and Unusual Punishments	
21-5439-	Supreme Court Clerk cover-ups	
22-20099-	Asst. D.A. Conspiracy	
21-7740-	Texas Children's Hosp. Corp. Crimes	
21-20440-	Prison Mail Misappropriations	
22-40140-	"	"
21-40473-	"	"
21-40560-	"	"
21-20546-	"	"
21-5507	"	"
22-20096	Court Reporters delete transcripts	
21-7797-	Texas Medical Board cover-ups	

- 22-20094- Supreme Court Clerk cover-ups
- 22-20133- Zinnant Project cover-ups.
- 20-40547. Prison stealing lawbooks
- 21-20374. Z.R.S. Refuse to pay Stimulus Check
- 21-20669- Gov. Greg Abbott's cover-ups
- 21-40483- Rabbi Retaliation
- 21-20444- "
- 20-8406 Stealing Criminal Complaints by State
Madroom officials. (Prison)
- 21-7531- Stealing of two (2) Homes and Property
- 21-40850- Slender
- 21-20608- City of Conroe
- 21-20373- Federal Investigation sought.

FIFTH CIRCUIT COURT:

- 22-20246- Fed Judge cover-ups
- 22-20225- " "
- 22-20235- " "
- 22-40331- " "
- 22-40292- " "
- 22-40304- " "

- 22-20245- Texas Children's Hospital crimes
- 22-20214- Trial Judge conspiracy
- 22-20132- Zoen H. Dreyer, Corp. Criminal
- 22-20244. Prison Abuses
- 22-40331- Fifth Cir. Fed. Judge cover-ups
- 22-20185- Child Support Harassment
- 22-40702- Kelosh Law Firm crimes
- 22-20230- Actual Innocent Chase cover-ups
- 22-20091- Baylor Corporate Crimes
- 22-20182- Innocent Network cover-ups
- 22-20179- Plaintiffs crimes, taking bribes

U.S. SOUTHERN DIST. COURT:

- 4:22-CV-01672 Fed Judge cover-ups
- 4:22-CV-00668 "
- 4:22-CV-1466 Supreme Court Clerk removes civil action against himself.
- H-22-767 Prison Mail Misrepresentation.
- 4:22-CV-00769- Gov. Greg Abbott's cover-ups.
- 4:22-CV-01751- Stealing ~~III~~ mail

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<u>CASES:</u>	<u>CITED:</u>	<u>PAGE NO.</u>
RICO - ANTI-SLAPP		8-10
MERITORIOUS CLAIMS		11-12
<u>Smith v. Indiana Dept of Corrections</u> , 883		
N.E. 2d 802 (2nd. 2008)		14
<u>Legal Services Corp. v. Velazquez</u> , 531 U.S. 533		
542-43 121 S. Ct. 1043 (2001)		15
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure		16
Prison Litigation Reform Act.		16
First Amendment.		17
RICO 18 USC Sec. 1961-1968		17-19
<u>Chevron Corp. v. Donziger</u> , 974 F. Supp 2d		
362, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 28253 (S.D.N.Y.)		
March 4, 2014		18

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3-4 ^{3A}
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	5-25
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	26-27
CONCLUSION	28

INDEX OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX "A"

Decision of the U.S. Southern District

APPENDIX "B"

Decision of the Fifth Circuit.

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 judgment below:

OPINIONS BELOW

Federal courts:

- The opinion of the U.S. Southern District
court as it appears in Appendix "A"
- The opinion of the U.S. Fifth Circuit
court as it appears in Appendix "B"

Due to corruption no reports were published.

JURISDICTION

Federal courts:

- The date on which the U.S. Southern District Court decided my case was March, 18, 2022 as seen in Appendix "A"
- The date on which the U.S. Fifth Circuit Court decided my case was May 17, 2022 as seen in Appendix "B".

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

Due to corruption no rehearings were sought.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

FIRST AMENDMENT: THE RESPONDENT HAS JOINED MANY OTHER FEDERAL JUDGES OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY TO "SILENCE ME" THAT'S BEEN THEIR GOAL FOR THE PAST DECADE, AS ALL I'VE DONE FOR THE PAST DECADE WAS TO EXPOSE THEM. THE RESPONDENT WANTS TO STOP MY REDRESSING MY GRIEVANCES EXPOSING THE STATES WITNESSED CRIMES AS IF EXPOSED, THEN THE CORPORATE LIABILITIES ARE EXPOSED AND IF THEIR EXPOSED, THEN THEIR COVERS-UP FOR THOSE CRIMES AND LIABILITIES ARE EXPOSED; RESULTING IN RICK PERRY'S COCCUYON CRIMES; IMPLICATING THE REPUBLICAN PARTY AND VIOLATE THE "GOVERNMENT'S" CRIMES AGAINST ITS CITIZENS. HENCE THE GOVERNMENT; (A) SILENCED MY FREEDOM OF SPEECH; (B) DENIED ME THE REDRESS OR MY GRIEVANCES AND THUS MY FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS.

FIFTH AMENDMENT: THE RESPONDENT HAS BEEN RESPONSIBLE FOR DISMISSING FIVE(S) CIVIL ACTIONS WITHOUT INVESTIGATION OF THE FACTS AND CIRCUMSTANCES, EVEN AFTER BEING INFORMED OF THEM. HE'S RESPONSIBLE FOR DENYING MY DUE PROCESS RIGHTS. HAD ANY OF THE CASES HE AND HIS U.S. SOUTHERN DISTRICT COURT CROMBIES DISMISSED (OVER 100) THE DOMINO EFFECT WOULD HAVE STARTED UNRAVELING THEIR LIES TO EXPOSE THEM.

SIXTH AMENDMENT: EVIDENCE CLEARLY PROVES THAT THE STATES WITNESSES; DR./DIRECTOR; ZOLAN R. DREYER FORGERIED MY SON'S MEDICAL RECORD TO USE TO DECEIVE THE DISTRICT COURT JUDGE IN MY ANNUALMENT CHILD CUSTODY HEARING AFTER THREE (3) PRIOR FAILED ATTEMPTS TO DO THE SAME. SINCE THIS CASE AS WELL AS ALL SAID CIVIL ACTIONS STEM FROM "ONE" COVER-UP CONSPIRACY, "ALL RESPONDENTS"

EQUALLY SHARE IN IT AS IT'S ONE CONTINU-
ABLE DECADENT CONSPIRACY TO
HIDE; POLITICAL, JUDICIAL AND CORPORATE
RICO CRIMES GIVING PROTECTIONS TO CORP-
ORATIONS BRIBING AND FUNDING THE RE-
PUBLICAN PARTY. HENCE THE RESPONDENT
IS EQUALLY RESPONSIBLE FOR THE DENIAL
OF MY COMPULSORY PROCESS TO OBTAIN
WITNESSES, HAVE A IMPARTIAL TRIBUNAL
AND A PUBLIC HEARING.

FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT: THE RESPONDENT
HAS DENIED ME THE EQUAL PROTECTIONS OF
THE LAW, DEPRIVED ME OF MY LIFE, LIBERTY
AND PROPERTY AND REFUSED ME DUE PRO-
CESS.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

THIS CASE STEMS FROM THE U.S. SOUTHERN DISTRICT COURTS COVER-UP OF POLITICAL, JUDICIAL AND CORPORATE ROCKEFELLER'S CRIMES, FALSE IMPRISONMENT, CHILD ABDUCTION, THEFT, COLLUSION, PHYSICAL EVIDENCE FABRICATION ETC. SEE FIFTH CIRCUIT CASE NO. 19-20717; ALL EXHIBITS, BRIEFS, MOTIONS ETC. ALSO: SUPREME COURT CASE NO. 21-5439, AND ALL RELATED CASES.

I.

THE RESPONDENT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR COVERING UP CRITICAL CASES. SEE:

PETERS VS. KIMBERLY JORDAN; CORPORATE CRIMINAL CASE NO. 4:22-CV-01674.

PETERS VS. TEXAS CHILD SUPPORT; KEN PATTON FIFTH CIRCUIT NO. 22-20185

PETERS VS. THE INNOCENT NETWORK; NO. 22-20182

PETERS VS. LEE H. ROSENTHAL; NO. 22-20152

PETERS VS. DAVID HITTLER; 4:22-CV-00668

IT'S NO COINCIDENT THAT THE RESPONDENT
DISMISSED ALL THESE CASES WITHOUT INVESTI-
GATING THE FACTS AND CIRCUMSTANCES. HE
COVERS-UP FOR SENIOR JUDGE, DAVID HITTIN-
GER WHEREIN THE EVIDENCE PROVES MY
ACTUAL INNOCENCE AND CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS
DEPRIVATIONS; SEE CASE NO. 4:18-CV-645.

II.

THE RESPONDENT IS NOW "INITIATING" CASE
NO. 4:22-CV-00668.

III.

SEEN IN (EXHIBIT NO. 1), THE RESPONDENT
QUOTES THE PRISON LITIGATION REFORM ACT,
(P.L.R.A.). HE SPEAKS ABOUT "FRIVOLOUS AND
MALICIOUS" CIVIC ACTION SUITS, BUT CANNOT
SHOW WHERE ANY SUCH CASE WAS FILED.
ONE MUST CONSIDER THAT THE JUDGES
OF ALL TEXAS COURTS; THE FIFTH CIRCUIT
AND THE SUPREME COURT (LEROY, SCOTT

HARRIS HAVE ALL BEEN INVOLVED IN THIS
REPUBLICAN PARTY CONSPIRACY TO COVER-UP
THE PARTIES; POLITICAL, JUDICIAL AND CORP-
ORATE RACKETEERING CRIMES, STARTING IN
MY ANNULMENT CASE IN 2012 IN MONTGO-
MERY COUNTY; CASE NO. 12-08-09259-CR AND
CONTINUING THROUGH CASE NO. 14-07-08207-
CR AND ALL SUBSEQUENT APPEALS.

IV.

IT'S A DECADÉ COVER-UP FOR MY ACTUAL
INNOCENCE TO INSURE I STAY IMPRI-
SONED AND KEPT SILENT. THE SENIOR
JUDGES OF THE U.S. SOUTHERN DISTRICT
ARE TAKING BRIBES FROM BAYCOR AND
TEXAS CHILDREN'S CORPORATIONS IN HOUS-
TON, TEXAS, LOOK TO THEM. THE "COVER-
UPS AND PROTECTION" RACKET FOR SAID

CORPORATE CRIMES AND LIABILITIES HAS
CONTINUED NON-STOP FOR A DECADE.
THEIR CRIMES COVERING-UP FOR THEM
BY IMPRISONING AN INNOCENT AMERICAN
CITIZEN TO SILENCE HIS FREEDOM OF
SPEECH HAS CAUSED THESE CORRUPTED
FEDERAL JUDGES AND SAID CORPORATIONS
TO BECOME LIABLE UNDER THE RICO
ANTI-SCAMP LAWS.

V.
(STRATEGIC LAWSUIT AGAINST PUBLIC PART-
ICIPATION) LAWS CAN BE APPLIED IN AN
ATTEMPT TO CURB ALLEGED ABUSES OF
THE LEGAL SYSTEM BY INDIVIDUALS OR
CORPORATIONS WHO USE THE COURTS AS
A WEAPON TO RETALIATE AGAINST
"WASTLE-BLOWERS", VICTIMS OR TO SILENCE

ANOTHER'S SPEECH. [THE EVIDENCE SHOWS
(A) Z WAS PRETESTING THESE CORPORATIONS;
(B) Z MADE YOUTUBE VIDEOS TO EXPOSE
GOV. RICK PERRY AND SEVERAL OTHERS
COVERING-UP SAID CORPORATE CRIMES.
THEY WANTED TO SILENCE ME AND
DID SO BY PUTTING ON A ONE SIDED
TRIAL DENYING ME ALL EVIDENCE AND
WITNESSES CORROBORATING SAID EVID-
ENCE EXPOSING THE CORPORATE CRIMES
AND THE GOVERNMENTS COVER UP FOR
THEM INCLUDING THE RESPONDENTS
INVOLVEMENTS.

VI.

RICO COULD BE ALLEGED IF IT CAN BE
SHOWN THAT LAWYERS AND/OR THEIR
CLIENTS CONSPIRED AND COLLABORATED

TO CONDUCT FRIVOLIOUS LEGAL COMPLAINTS
SOLELY IN RETRIBUTION AND RETALIATION
FOR THEMSELVES HAVING BEEN BROUGHT
BEFORE THE COURTS."

VII.

THEY ALL KNEW THAT THAT WAS MY IN-
TENT AND THAT IS WHY I INDICATED PRO-
TESTING IN FRONT OF TEXAS CHILDREN'S
HOSPITAL IN 2012 AND MAKING OVER
(150) YOUTUBE VIDEOS.

VIII.

THE LIABILITIES ARE UP TO A 300 MILLION
IN DAMAGES, PUNITIVE. IN THIS CASE SINCE
THE GOVERNMENT CONSPIRED, DAMAGES
EXCEEDED 3.3 BILLION DOLLARS AND THAT'S
THE REASON THESE FEDERAL JUDGES

ARE ALL INVOLVED.

IX.

THESE CORPORATIONS ARE MORE THAN HAPPY TO COVER-UP BY PAYING OUT "BRIBES" IN THE MILLIONS TO AVOID PAYING PUNITIVE DAMAGES IN THE BILLION, AND THE "LOCAL" FEDERAL JUDGES ARE ONLY TOO HAPPY TO TAKE THEM OVER (100) CIVIL ACTIONS RELATED TO THE COVER-UP OF THESE CORPORATIONS CORPORATE CRIMES HAVE BEEN "DISMISSED" AT TRIVOLOUS UNDER THEIR IMPOSED "THREE-STRIKE" PROVISION.

X.

"MERITORIOUS CLAIMS"

THE SUPREME COURT HAS SAID THAT "SOL-TIONS" MAY NOT BE IMPOSED AGAINST PERSONS IN NO BRING CITIGATION UNLESS THE

LITIGATION IS BOTH OBJECTIVELY AND SUBJECTIVELY WITHOUT BIAS. WE KNOW BY THE EVIDENCE THAT ZACHARY E. DREYER AND ~~MAZEL~~ MITAL K. BRUHAMBLATT; BOYLER EMPLOYEES CONSPIRED WITH STORMA RITORE MY WIFE'S COUNSEL TO REBROADCAST THE TEXAS CHILDREN'S HOSPITALS MEDICAL RECORDS TO DECEIVE DISTRICT COURT JUDGE; JENNIFER ROBIN IN MY DOCUMENT, CASE NO. 12-08-07259-CR AFTER THREE(3) PRIOR REJECTED ATTEMPTS MAKING BOTH CORPORATIONS LIABLE.

XI.

SUBSEQUENTLY A NATIONAL REPUBLICAN PARTY COVER-UP ENSUED, WHICH INCLUDE THE RESPONDENT AND HIS COURTHOUSE CRIMES...

XVI.

THEIR THREE-STRIKE PROVISION ORDERED BY JUDGE NANCY Z. ATLAS WAS IMPOSED AS A WEAPON TO SILENCE MY EXPOSING THEIR CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY TO COVER UP FOR THESE BILLION DOLLAR CORPORATE CRIMES. THATS WHY NOT ONE JUSTICE BOTHERED TO DO ANY INVESTIGATION AS THEY ALL KNEW AND ALL WANTED BRIBER MONEY.

XVII.

THIS SECRET REPUBLICAN PARTY INTER-CIRCLE OF JUDGES WERE PROTECTING GOV. RICK PERRY'S COCCUSION CRIMES. HE WAS FUND-ED BY HOUSTON'S MEDICAL INDUSTRY, AND NOT CIL AND GDS. SO HE APPOINTED DR. IRVIN ZETTLER DIRECTOR OF THE TEXAS MEDICAL BOARD, WHO COVERED UP

THE "IRREFUTABLE EVIDENCE" OF THE "STATES"
WITNESSES CRIMES (DR. ZUANN E. DREYER)

IX.

FIFTH CIRCUIT JUDGE; GREG ACOSTA IS FROM
HOUSTON, TEXAS WHEREIN THESE CORPORATIONS
HEADQUARTER; HE TOOK A BRIBE TOO, MAK-
ING THIS "NATIONAL CORRUPTION" AND THE
LIABILITIES EVEN GREATER. SUPREME COURT
CLERK; SCOTT MORRIS (REPUBLICAN) WITHHELD
MY APPEAL ON CERTIORARI FOR SIX (6)
MONTHS BEFORE HE FINALLY TOLD ~~ME~~ ~~THE~~
IT WAS DISMISSED BARRING MY APPEAL
BEFORE THE "THREE-JUDGE" PANEL.

X.

Smith v. Indiana Dept. of Corrections;
883 N.E. 2d 802 (Ind. 2008) (Three-strikes
unconstitutional) upon Court (house

ADVOCACY IN LITIGATION IS SPEECH AND PROTECTED BY THE FIRST AMENDMENT.

Legal Service Corp. v. Velazquez, 531 U.S. 533, 542-43 121 S. Ct. 1043 (2001) (holding representation is speech.

THE BODY OF LAW REQUIRES THAT RESTRICTIONS ON EXPRESSION BE NARROWLY TAILORED TO THE PROBLEMS THEY ARE TO SOLVE, THAT DOES NOT INCLUDE SILENCING ONES "FREEDOM OF SPEECH TO COVER-UP: 'POLITICAL, JUDICIAL AND CORPORATE RACKETEERING CRIMES'."

XVI.

APPLIED TO THE "THREE-STRIKES" PROVISION IS THE "BREATHING SPACE" PRINCIPLE WHICH WOULD MEAN THAT PRISONERS COULD ONLY

"SANCTIONED" FOR LAWSUITS THAT WERE NOT ONLY OBJECTIVELY WITHOUT MERIT BUT WERE ALSO KNOWN BY THE PLAINTIFF TO BE MERITLESS. [Z CAN TELL YOU FIRST HAND AND BY THE EVIDENCE AND SUPPORTING CORROBORATING WITNESSES, Z KNOW NO SUCH THINGS].

SEE: Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60b).
NOT A STRIKE.

XVII.

PRISON CITIZATION REFORM ACT. (P.C.R.A.)

THE NINTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS HELD THAT THE "THREE-STRIKES" PROVISION DOES NOT APPLY TO FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS REGARDLESS OF THE FORM OF RELIEF SOUGHT. AS DEPRIVATIONS OF

THE "FIRST AMENDMENT" ENTITLES A
PRISONER TO RELIEF WHOLLY ASIDE FROM
ANY PHYSICAL, MENTAL OR EMOTIONAL
INJURY INCURRED. SEEN IN (EXHIBIT NO. 1)
AND APPENDIX "A"; THE U.S. SOUTHERN
DISTRICT JUDGES QUOTE: ("Peter's allegations
do not plead any facts showing that he is in
any immediate danger which would warrant
waiver of the fee requirement"). THE CON
IS CLEAR WHERE (FIRST AMENDMENT) VIOL
ATIONS ARE PROVEN.

XVIII.

RICO

RACKETEERING INFLUENCE AND CORRUPT
ORGANIZATION'S ACT. 18 USC. SECTION 1961-
1968 COMPLY.

Chevron Corp. v. Donziger, 974 F. Supp. 2d 362, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 28253 (S.D.N.Y. March 4, 2014). (obtained by fraud, coercion and bribery, her standing under the U.S. Constitution, Article III. (The redressability requirement for purposes of U.S. Const III Art III standing focuses on whether a plaintiff personally would benefit in a tangible way from the court's intervention i.e. whether the plaintiff personally has shown an injury to himself that is likely to be redressed by favorable decision. A plaintiff satisfies the redressability requirement when he shows that a favorable decision will relieve a discrete injury to himself. He need not show

that a favorable decision will relieve his every injury. 18 U.S.C.S. Sec. 1961(5) requires at least two acts of racketeering activity occurring within (10) ten years of each other. (29 This case the cover-ups have lasted for the past 10 ten years...

XX.

The imposition of a wrongful debt constitutes an injury, hence "sanctions". Legal fees may constitute damages under the Racketeering Influence & Corrupt Organizations Act. (RICO) 18 U.S.C.S. Section 1961-1968. When they are proximately caused by a RICO violation. The Second Circuit concludes that a federal court is authorized to grant equitable relief to a private plaintiff who

19.

her proven injury to business or property. The issue here is not what happened over 10 ten years ago and who if anyone is responsible for the wrongs done. It is instead is whether a courts decision was procured by corrupt means regardless of whether the case was just.

XX.

THE EVIDENCE IS IRREFUTABLE PROVING:

- (A.) MY ACTUAL INNOCENCE
- (B.) THE STATES WITNESSES CRIMES
- (C.) THE CORPORATIONS CRIMES FOR
THOSE CRIMES
- (D.) THE GOVERNMENTI COVER UPS OF THE
ABOVE.

THE EVIDENCE PROVES THE CORPORATIONS

BRIED THE COURTS UNDER THE RICO-ANTISLAPP LAWS, INCURRING SEVERE AND IRREPARABLE DAMAGES TO MR. IRREGULARITIES OF THE AMOUNT OR FAULT INCURRED, THE RESPONDENT ACTED IN CON-
SOM WITH OTHERS TO FURTHER THE RICO CRIME(S). (Exhibit No. 1) proves the RESPONDENT NOT ONLY RETALIATED AND IGNORED ALL THE EVIDENCE AND FACT BUT SOUGHT TO PUNISH THE PETITIONER BY GRANTING REMA PROPERIS, THEN ~~SO~~ "SIMULTANEOUSLY" DENIED THE PETITION IN RETRIBUTION FOR ANY EXPOSING HIS COURTHOUSE FRIENDS AND THE REPUBLICAN PARTY'S CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY TO COVER UP SAID CORPORATE CRIME AND LIABILITIES FOR BRIBES.

IN FORMA PAUPERIS

DEFINITION: LAT. IN THE MANNER OF A PAUPER.
WITH REGARD TO PLEADINGS, OPPORTUNITY TO
SER IN FORMA PAUPERIS "GRANTS A PARTY"
THE RIGHT TO PROCEED WITHOUT ASSUMING
THE BURDEN OR COSTS. YET THE RESPON-
DENTS IS CONTRADICTORY TO THIS DEFINITION
AND ORDERS THAT Z PAY IN FULL. ONE
CANNOT BY LAW OR DEFINITION DO BOTH
PUNISHING WITH INTENT TO PUNISH AND DENY
JUSTICE ALL AT ONCE. "GRANTING" FORMA PAU-
PERIS DOES NOT MEAN PAY IN FULL. WHY
LIE? WHY FORCE ME TO PAY AND AT
THE SAME TIME ~~DEAL~~ THE DISTRICT THE
CASE IN RESPONDENTS PURPOSE WAS NOT
TO PUNISH? RESPONDENTS INTENT WAS TO
PUNISH ME FOR EXPOSING AN COURTHOUSE
FRIENDS. SEE (EXHIBIT NO. 1)

XVI.

THE RESPONDENT TOOK PART WILLING TO
HARM AND DAMAGE THE PETITIONER AND
ALSO DENY RELIEF FROM HIS SUFFERINGS
CAUSED BY THIS PARTIES CONSPIRACY
TO COVER UP CORPORATE CRIMES FOR
PROFITS AND OR EQUORS.

XVII.

THE RESPONDENTS PART IN THIS CRIM-
INAL CONSPIRACY WAS DONE WITH MAL-
ICE AND INTENT. HE IS NOT IMMUNE
AS CORRUPTION IS NOT IMMUNABLE. CON-
SPIRACY IS NOT IMMUNABLE. JUDICIAL MAL-
FEASANCE AND RACKETEERING IS NOT
IMMUNABLE. HE DID NOT MAKE A
SIMPLE MISTAKE BUT RATHER JOINED

A CRIMINAL ORGANIZATION KNOWN AS THE
INTER-CIRCLE OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY
TO MOP-UP ITS CRIMES AND LIABILITIES
BY ANY MEANS NECESSARY, IN-
CLUDING IGNORING THE FACTS AND
EVIDENCE, IMPOSING ILLEGAL SANCTIONS
NEARLY TO HARM AND CURB A WHISTLE-
BLOWERS EXPOSING HIS POLITICAL PARTYS
CRIMES AND LIABILITIES BY IGNORING
CRIMES TO TAKE BRIDES,

RELIEF

RELIEF IS SOUGHT IN THE SUM OF
\$24,000,000.00 MILLION DOLLARS, AND
A FEDERAL INVESTIGATION TO DETERMINE
HIS DISBARMENT, AND PUNISHMENT.

THE RESPONDENT SHOULD BE REMOVED
FROM THE BENCH AND BAR FOR RICO
CRIMES COMMON SENSE DICTATES HE
KNEW WHAT HE WAS DOING AND
WHAT WAS AT STAKE, BUT CHOSE TO
BE CORRUPT AND IGNORE HIS OATH OF
OFFICE TO UPHOLD JUSTICE.

Respectfully submitted

Michael G. Petri

JUNE 28, 2022 - Petitioner.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

1. TWO (2) FEDERAL JUDGES DISAGREE ON THE SAME POINT OF LAW IN RE TO THE PRISON LITIGATION REFORM ACTS (P.L.R.A.) "THREE-STRIKES" PROVISION.
2. JUDICIAL CORRUPTION AND ITS COVER-UP IS ILLEGAL AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL.
3. SANCTIONS CAN NOT BE IMPOSED AGAINST LITIGANTS WHO'S CIVIL ACTIONS HAVE MERIT.
4. THE RESPONDENT IS "NOT IMMUNE" FROM PARTICIPATING IN A DECADRE OLD POLITICAL JUDICIAL AND CORPORATE RECRUITING COVER-UP. SHE IS A CONSPIRATOR, AND THUS SHOULD FACE FEDERAL INVESTIGATORS WHEN THIS CASE COMES TO JUSTICE.

5. THE RESPONDENT JOINS A CONSIST OF "REPUBLICAN JUDGES" AIDING AND ABETTING THE PARTIES COVER-UPS FOR POLITICAL, JUDICIAL AND CORPORATE RACKETEERING, COLLUSION, CHILD ABDUCTION, FALSE IMPRISONMENT CRIMES, MUST FROM THE U.S. SOUTHERN DISTRICT COURT.

6. THE RESPONDENT MADE NO INVESTIGATION INTO THE FACTS AND CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE CASE; SHE SIMPLY AIDED HER COURTROOM CRONIES IN THEIR CRIMINAL COVER-UPS. THERE IS NO IMMUNITY FOR "JUDICIAL CORRUPTION" CRIMES.

7. THE RESPONDENT "RETAILED" FOR MY EXPOSING ONE OF HIS CRONIES FOR ~~COVER~~ COVERING-UP THEIR COVER-UPS.

CONCLUSION

IN CONCLUSION "NOBODY" IS ABOVE THE LAW.
CRONISONS IS UNETHICAL AND BIAS. FEDERAL
JUDGES HAVE A "DUTY" TO INVESTIGATE THE
FACTS AND CIRCUMSTANCES OF A CASE TO
ASCERTAIN WHETHER IT HAS MERIT AND NOT
SIMPLY "RUBBER STAMP" A DISMISSAL BECAUSE
IT INVOLVES ONE OF HER CRONIES AND
CO-WORKERS. THE RESPONDENT "RETALIATED"
DISMISSING AS FRIVOLOUS, THEN ORDERING
COURT FEES TO BE PAID IN AN AP-
PLICATION FOR FORMA PAUPERIS.

The petition for a writ of certiorari should
be granted

Respectfully submitted

Matthew C. Patti

June 28, 2022

NO. 22-20166

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

MICHAEL GEOFFREY PETERS - PETITIONER

VS.

ANDREW S. HANEN - RESPONDENT

PROOF OF SERVICE

Comes now the Petitioner who swears under penalty of perjury that a true and correct copy of this Writ of Certiorari and Form 6 Paupers was mailed to the Respondent in accordance with Supreme Court Rule 29

to:
U.S. Southern District Court
% Andrew S. Hanen
P.O. Box 61010
Houston, Texas 77204

On June 28, 2022 by First class mail.

Sworn by

Michael C. Feltre

Executed June 28, 2022