No. 22-5375

ORIGINAL

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

united states of America Nathaniel Waugh PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

A. Ralph — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

United states District court Southern District Miami FL.
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

United states of America EX Rel Nathaniel Waugh
(Your Name)

2020, Main st
(Address)

Sarasota FL 34837
(City, State, Zip Code)

(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

(1) Whether lower court proceeded "according to Justice" or deprived petitioner of fundemental substantial rights?

(2) whether Judgement is authorized by law or invalid, illegal, essentially irregular preJudical procedural error where Judge Roy K. Altman failed to produce actual factual transcript records, failed to answer legal question of law, conducted single mission ruling without the act of Congress?

(3) whether circuit court appellate procedures violated principles of law thereby irregular proceedings.

(4) whether constitution constitutes it as a palpable miscarriage of Justice?

(5) Whether the lower court applied the wrong rule of law to the evidence?

(6) did lower courts adopt any method unknown to the law or essentially irregular in the proceedings?

(7) Whether to grant certiorari should reviewing. Court review seriousness of the error, if any, and use it's discretion to correct error "only when there has been violation of clearly substantial principle of law resulting in miscarriage of Justice?

(8) Should united state supreme court be primarily concerned with seriousness of error mere existence of error departure from essential requirements of law is more than a legal error where it's an act that resulted in gross miscarriage of Justice a depature with failure to apply correct law?

(9) Whether departure from essential requirements of law caused irreparable inJury remediable on appeal. Reviewable by certiorari?

(10) Whether petitioner demonstrated concrete inJury that constitutes grounds for order to specifically address departure from requirements of law?

(11) petitioner questions the priority of a trial has he been denied a fair and reasonable speedy trial?

(12) Whether or not the specifications alleges an offense under Article 32?

(13) Whether or not there is probable cause to believe accused committed the offense charged?

(14) Whether or not the covening authority has court-martial Jurisdiction over accused and over the offense?

LIST OF PARTIES

[ ] All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.

[✓] All parties **do not** appear in the caption of the case on the cover page. A list of all parties to the proceeding in the court whose judgment is the subject of this petition is as follows: Joe Biden and cabinet officer, Solicitor General, Roy K. Altman Attorney General 28 U.S.C. § 2403(a) may apply and shall be served as defined by 28 U.S.C. § 451 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2403(a) ceritified to Attorney General the fact that the constitutionality of an Act of Congress was drawn into question. See Rule 14.1(e)(V)

RELATED CASES

Error § 21.9 Grant of certiorari Issue of Importance; Arbitration clause in International Contract. The united states court should grant certiorari to review because importance of the question. The question of Arbitration agreement in International contract is enforceable. Arbitration § 2 The Arbitration Act of 1925 (9 U.S.C.S. 1 et seq) reversing centuries of Judicial hostility. The Arbitration agreement is designed to allow parties to avoid costliness and delays of litigation and to place Arbitration agreement upon same footing as other contracts. Joe Biden and cabinet officer are responsible for concrete injury and should not have engaged in such conspiracy departure from essential law requirements constituted treasonable offense. A contractual provision specifying forum litigated and law to be applied is almost indespensable pre condition to the achievement of orderliness and predictability essential to any international transaction and obviates danger disputed under agreement must be submitted a forum hostile to interests of one party unfamiliar with the problem involved; a refusal by the court of one country refusing to enforce international arbitration agreements would only frustrate these purposes and invite destructive Jockeying by parties to secure tactical litigation advances. Arbitration § 2, laws § 15, contract § 101 Arbitration clause forum selection clause is enforceable upon grounds of fraud. An Arbitration, or forum or, forum selection clause in a contract is unenforceable if inclusion of that clause stipulated in contract was the product of fraud or coercion; mere facts arising from transaction is based on grounds that allege fraud and does not render Arbitration clause unenforceable. Arbitration § 2 convention as to foreign awards purpose the prinicipal adoption and implementation in enforcement to international agreement to Arbitrate A clause, contained in International sales contracts that any controversy or claim arising out of contract or breach there of would be referred to arbitration before International chamber of commerce paris, or france is to be respected by Federal courts in accord provisions of Arbitration Act of 1925 (9 U.S.C.S. 1 et seq) in purchasers action against seller for damages and other relief. (1) The purchasers is an American corporation with it's principal place of business and vast bulk of activity in united states, while the seller is a citizen of Germany (2) The negotiations leading to signing Contract in Austria and closing in Switzerland took place in united states. England and Germany involved Consultations with legal trade mark experts from each of those countries and from Liechtenstien and (3) most significantly the sub matter of the contract concerned sales of business enterprises organized under laws of Germany and primarily in European countries 10(b) Securities Exchange Act of 1934

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INDEX TO APPENDICES

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

(1) Belvin v. state 922. So. 2d 1046, 1048 (Fla 4th DCA 2006)

CASES Cohen V. Virginia 19 u.s. 264*5 L.Ed. 257 — PAGE NUMBER

(2) Collins v. yellen, 141 s.ct. 1761, 210 L.Ed. 2d 432 (2021) — (1) page# 5
(3) City of Miami v. Blanco, 2022 Fla. App. Lexis 2713 — (2) page# 6
(4) Dept of Revenue ex rel T.E.P v. price 958 so. 2d 1045 P 1046 — (3) page# 5
(5) Employers Fire Ins Co. v. Continental Ins co. 326 So. 2d 177 Fla (1976) — (4) page# 4
(6) First Justice of Bristol Juvenile court v. clerk of Magistrate 438 Mass, 387 780 N.E. 2d 908 (Mass 2003) — (5) page# 5
(7) Franklin v. united states 216 u.s. 559 — (6) page# 4
(8) Humphrey EX v. united states Rathbun v. same 295 u.s. 602, 55 S.ct 869 79 L.Ed. 1611 (1935) — (7) page# 3
(9) Jam v. united states 340 u.s. 593, 596, 71 s.ct. 515, 518, 95 L.Ed. 556 (1951) — (8) page # 6
(10) Metropolitan Dade County v. Blumenthal, 675 So 2d 598 — (9) page# 5
(11) Miami Dade cty v. publix supermarket, Inc, 305 So. 3d 668 — (10) page # 4
(12) Medellin, 552 u.s. at 508 — (11) page# 4
(13) Mora v. NewyorK 524 F.3d 183, 194 2d (cir 2008) — (12) page# 3
(14) Nixon v. Adm'r of General servs 433 u.s. 425 — (13) page# 3
(15) office of Ins. Regulations v. Fla Dept of Financial services, 159 So. 3d 945, 952 (Fla. 1st DCA 2015) — (14) page# 3
(15) page# 4

STATUTES AND RULES

(1) 18 u.s.c.s. § 242, Civil Rights § 12.5, Civil Rights § 13, Statute § 13, Conspiracy § 17, 2 u.s.c. § 192, 18 u.s.c.s § 52, 18 u.s.c. § 3486, 18 u.s.c. § 3, R.S. § 102, 28 Appendix u.s.c. Section 4 (united states code 2022) 9 u.s.c. § 1 et seq, 28 u.s.c.s § 1346 (b)(1). — (1) page# 3

(2) 28 u.s.c. § 1826(a), 18 u.s.c.s. § 2515, Fla. R. civ. p. 1.280(b)(1) 5 u.s.c.s. Ethic in Government Act of 1978, Title IV, office of Government Ethic § 401. — (2) page# 4

(3). 119.071(3)(a), 281.301 (Fla. stat 2021), u.s.c. § 554(C)(2) § 7, 5 u.s.c. § 556, Section 5 u.s.c § 533 39 CFR § 952.7, 39 u.s.c § 3012, §§ 952.10 and 952.11, 39 u.s.c § 3005(a), 15 CFR 906.7, 32 CFR § 776.84 776.81, 42 CFR § 93.519, 48 CFR § 1803.90, 37 CFR § 11.804, 39 CFR § 951.6, § 951.5, § 951.2, § 81.011, 28 u.s.c.s § 1651 part 1 of 2, Section 376 of title 28 u.s.c. 1940 ed., § 1257 — (3) page# 5

OTHER Error § 21.9, Arbitration § 2, The Arbitration Act of 1925, 9 u.s.c. 1 et seq, laws § 15, Contract § 101, Securities Exchange Act of 1934, The presidental Recording and Material perservation Act pub L. No. 93-526, §§ 104-5, § 9 (a) of the Hatch Act 18 u.s.c. Supp V § 61h, 31 u.s.c.s § 3729; 31 u.s.c.s § 3730(b); 31 u.s.c.s § 3730(c)(1); 31 u.s.c.s. § 3730 (C)(2)(A); 31 u.s.c.s § 3730(C)(2)(B) False claim Act

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

[✓] For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix A to the petition and is

[ ] reported at 21 - 12617 - J; or,
[ ] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
[✓] is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix ______ to the petition and is

[ ] reported at ______; or,
[ ] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
[✓] is unpublished.

[ ] 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,
[ ] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
[✓] is unpublished.

The opinion of the ______ court appears at Appendix ______ to the petition and is

[ ] reported at ______; or,
[ ] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
[✓] is unpublished.

JURISDICTION

[✓] For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was unsettled.

[ ] 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 No. __A____.

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

[ ] For cases from **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 Application No. __A____.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Judge Roy K. Altman and clerk of southern dist did join and facilitate conspiracy to commit fraudlent scheme with awarness of illegal activity did accept $ 400.00 Transaction fee created criminal liability with respect evidence proof shows public record agreement to devise fraudlent scheme before screening process, such agreement is all law requires as elemental factor. The breach of Judical code conduct conflicted with essential elements of conspiracy direct linkage substantial elements and sufficient factual details provides basis evidence proof that the Federal Arbitration Act shall be settled as source that enabled accordance with rules then in effect. 9. u.s.c, Section 2 U.S. Const. Art VI, clause 2, Civil Rights § 12.5, Civil Right § 13, statutes § 13 construction civil and Criminal sanctions. The phrase under color of any statue, ordinance, regulations or custom should be same construction in both 18 usc. 242 provides for criminal punishment of 42 usc 1983 gives right of action against a person who under color of state law subjects another to deprivation of any rights, priviliges, immunties, secured by Federal constitution Conspiracy § 17 criminal liability under 2 u.s.c. § 192 and 18 u.s.c 242 Shearson/Lehman Bros, Inc v. Ordonez 497 so 2d 703 was enacted to enforce § 1257(a),(b) its purpose is to protect persons in the united states in thier Civil Rights and furnish means of thier vindication. cong 39th Cong. 1st sess., p.217 southland corp v. Keating 465 u.s. 1 104 s.ct. quoting united states v. Fleischman 399 u.s. 349 (1) 2 u.s.c. § 192 (2) 18 u.s.c. § 3486. Discovery and Inspection § 15 failure to produce documents before congressional committee absence of quorum 2 u.s.c. § 192 Committee upon report to House Held that members of Executive Board were in contempt Following it's unsucessful attempt to obtain public records under 18 u.s.c § 3. R.S. § 102 Provides: Every one who having been summoned as witness by authority of either House of Congress to give testimony or produce papers willfully makes default. This criminal Statute limited by terms of two types of congressional orders (1) Subpoena to give testimony (2) Subpeona to produce documents. see Nixon v. Adm'r of General servs., 433 u.s. 425 under the Presidental Recording and materials perservation Act, pub. L. No. 93-526, §§ 104-5 court determined Act did not violete seperation of powers nor did it invade right of privacy court affirmed the order. Summons united states code (2022). A treaty is equivalent to an Act of legislature and is self executing operates without aid of legisalative provision in contrast treaty provision can be enforced pursuant legislation to carry it into effect see: united states Arbitration Act now 9 u.s.c. § 1 et seq H.R. Rep. No. 96 68th cong., 1st sess., 1, 2 (1924); S. Rep. No 536, 68th Cong., 1st sess (1924) Mora v. New york 524 F.3d 183, 194 (2d cir 2008) Medellin, 552 u.s. at 508 Treaty interpretation Mora, 524 F.3d at 194, determine what measures comply with treaty obligations. International convenant civil political Rights Dec. 19, 1996 Art. 9, 999 U.N.T.S. 171, 175-176 In accordance with anyone who has been victim of unlawful arrest or detention shall have enforceable right to compensation. Federal Tort claims Act 28 u.s.c.s. § 1346(b)(1) Authorizes suit for injury caused by negligent or wrongful act or omission of any employee of government while within scope of his office or employment. See: § 9(a) of the Hatch Act 18 u.s.c. supp V § 61 h Fla. stat § 286.011 port Everglades Auth v. international longshoremen's Assn, Local 1922-1, 652 So. 2d 1169

Statement of The case

under 10 U.S.C. Sec. 832 Article 32. A conspiracy to commit fraudlent schemes occured Internal Revenue services did engage in Tax invasion fraud. petitioner Satisified burden of proof substantial evidence does currently exist in public records united states Military officials did engage in tax invasion fraud that is a concrete injury and direct results of Joe Bidens inability to supervise monitor Joint administration operations clearly establish failure to execute duty oath of office affirmative proof of the claim is the direct results of infletion affecting the economy. petitioner satisfied burden of proof public servant Knew and should have Known that personnel actions are prohibited misrepresentation where Joe Biden and cabinet did mishandle statements of facts also true statement of facts, petitioner has standing to challenge the line Item Veto Act (the Act) 2 U.S.C.S. § 691 et seq (Supp. 1997) and that the Act was unconstitutional. Congress passed the Line Item Veto Act, 2 U.S.C. § 691 et seq. Supp 1997) which gave the president the power to cancel items in any bill. petitioner has been individually or concretely harmed by the Act and the official congressional power as a whole was affected. The Line Item veto Act 2 U.S.C. § 691 et seq (Supp. 1997) provides that any member of congress or any individual affected by the Act may bring an action, in the united states District for the District of Columbia, for declaratory Judgement and injunctive relief on the ground that any provision of this part Violates the constitution. 2 U.S.C. § 692(a)1. Under U.S. Const. Art III § 2. the federal courts have jurisdiction over disputes between parties only if it's a "case" or controversy. One element of case or controversy requirements. under U.S. Const. Art III, § 2 is that plaintiff based on complaint must establish that they have standing to sue. The standing inquiry focuses on whether the plaintiff is the proper party to bring this suit, although that inquiry often turns on nature and source of the claim asserted. To meet standing requirements of U.S. Const. Art III, § 2. plaintiff must allege personal injury fairly traceable to defendants allegedly unlawful conduct and likely to be redressed by the request relief. The supreme Court has consistently stressed that plaintiff must establish that he has a personal stake in the alleged dispute and that the alleged injury suffered is particularized as to him. The supreme court has alwayz insisted on strict compliance with the Jurisdictional standing requirement of U.S. Const. Art III § 2. The standing inquiry is especially rigorous when reaching merits of dispute force the court to decide whether an action taken by one of the two branches of the Federal Government was unconstitutional. The court must carefully inquire as to whether plaintiff met the burden of establishing that the claimed injury is personal, particularized, concrete and otherwise Judically cognizable. Raines V. Byrd, 521 U.S. 811 under the Act, of the right to vote on precise text that would ultimately become law was essential to legislators office and constituted a sufficient (1) injury to provide every member of Congress with standing to challenge the constitutionality of the Act. and (2) basis for concluding that the Act was unconstitutional.

Statement of The case

Article 76 of the uniform code of military Justice, 10 U.S.C. § 876, provides that military review of court-martial conviction shall be final and conclusive and binding upon all courts of the united states. The manual for court-martial was prescribed by the president pursuant to Article 36 of the uniform code of military Justice 10 U.S.C. § 836, it is a guide book that summarizes the rules of evidence applied by Court-martial review boards. The paragraph regarding accomplice testimony is a statutory rule of evidence. such rules do not customarily involve Constitution questions. Rules of evidence are designed in the interest of fair trials. But unfairness in result no sure measure of unconstitutionality When the courts look at the requirements of procedural due process, the use of accomplice testimony is not catalogued with constitutional restriction The Jencks Act provides that when a witness testifies for the united States the government may be required to produce "any statement" of the witness which relates to his testimony. 18 U.S.C.S. § 3500(b), The term "statement" is defined in 18 U.S.C.S. § 3500(e) as: a written statement made by said witness and signed or otherwise adopt or approved by him; or (2) a stenographic, mechanical, electrical, or other recording, or a transcript thereof, which is substantially verbatim recital of an oral statement made by said witness to an agent of the government and recorded Contemporaneously with making of such oral statement. The administration of the Jencks Act must be entrusted to the good sense and experience of the trial Judges subject to appropriately limited review of appellate Courts. Apart from trials conducted in violation of express constitutional mandates, a constitutionally unfair trial takes place only where the barriers and safeguards are so relaxed or forgotten that the proceeding is more a spectacle or trial by ordeal than disciplined contest. It is proper for law officer in court-martial proceeding to rule under the Jencks Act 18 USC 3500 that government bears the burden to produce a tape recording made by government of the questioning of defendants and other persons involved in the offense or explain why it cannot do so.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

I. petition for writ of prohibition reviewable by certiorari. To warrant relief, departure must be "so erroneous that Justice requires it to be corrected. Dept of Revenue ex rel. T.E.P. V. price 958 so. 2d 1045 p. 1046. Sutton v. State 975 So. 2d 1073 p. 1080 Standard of review. (1.) Joe Biden and cabinet abused public office knowingly did engage in departure from requirement of law. Joe Biden and cabinet are responsible for corruptive Conditions of administrative law agency also failure to supervise monitor law making process in Connection of Judicial branch. (A) Administrative law Judge Roy K. Altman engaged in sham pleading, produced no lawful factual finding in accordance accurate administrative law. The departure from requirement of law is so serious that no actual records exist as Conclusive evidence of actual factual transcript records nor real reality contents regarding scope of records See. terms and phrases defined in "5 us.c.s. Ethic in Government Act of 1978, Title IV. office of Government Ethics § 401. challenges the law. (B) See: First Justice of Bristol Juvenille court V. clerk of Magistrate of the 438 Mass, 387, 780 N.E. 2d 908 (Mass 2003). The Clerks role poses serious dispute concerning adding identical responsibility to first Justice Roy K. Altman demonstrates fundamental error miscarriage of Justice. Exception that is necessary for Justice to correct or Justify consideration of default claim, under timelessness rules to Correct the procedural errors including deadlines. The abandonment of the default Claim is unjustified thereby united states court of Appeal also inconsistent with administrative law rules and procedures. Futhermore inadequate approach for resolving the issue matters and as a matter of law constitutes departure from essential law requirements. See Miami-Dade cty v. publix supermarkets, Inc, 305 So. 3d 668 granted petition for certiorari and agreed circuit court failed to observe the departure from essential requirements of law grossly affected Justice and clearly established principle of law resulting in Miscarriage of Justice. met or satisified burden of proof thereby competent substantial evidence invalidated agency decisions. Gelbard v. united states 408 u.s. 41 28 u.s.c.s. § 1826 (a) also 18 u.s.c.s § 2515 (quoting) Metropolitan Dade county v. Blumenthal, 675 So 2d 598 (C). whether circuit court departed from essential requirements of law (a) Denial of procedural due process of law by the circuit Court. (b) An improper exercise of Jurisdiction by circuit court such as applying an incorrect procedure of law which is fundamental error in character as to fatally infect or affect the proceeding. omitted in Suzuki motor corp v. Winckler, 284 So 3d 1107 (1) resulting in material injury. (2) A departure from the essential requirements of law. Fla R. civ. P. 1.280 (b)(1) Discovery Relevance of Discoverable information (Allowing a party to discover any matter that is not priviliged and is relevant to subject matter of the pending action or appears reasonably calculated to lead to discovery of admissible evidence. See office of Ins. Regulation v. Fla Dept of Financial Services, 159 So. 3d 945, 952 (Fla. 1st DCA 2015) Gibbons v. Ogden, 22 u.s. 1 6 L. Ed 23. u.s.c.s. Const Art III, § 2, cl2.

Reason For Granting The petition

10 U.S.C. Sec. 832 Article 32 preliminary hearing requlred before referral (a) In General (1),(A),(b) (2) The purpose of preliminary hearing shall be limited to determing following: (A) Whether or not the specification alleges an offense under this chapter. (B) Whether or not there is probable cause to believe that accused Committed the offense charged. (C) Whether or not the covening authority has court-martial Jurisdiction over accused and over the offense. (D) A recommendation as to the disposition that should be made of the case. (b) Hearing officer - (1) A preliminary hearing under this section shall be conducted by an impartial hearins officer, who (A) whenever praticable shall be a Judge advocate who is certified under Section 827 (b)(2) of this title (Article 27(b)(2); or (B) when it is not practicable to appoint a Judge advocate so certified. (2) In the case of a hearing officer under paragraph (1)(B), a Judge advocate who is certified under section 827 (b)(2) of this title (Article 27 (b)(2) shall be availiable to provide legal advice to hearing officer (3) whenever practicable, the hearing officer shall be equal in grade or senior in grade to military counsel who are detailed to represent the accused or the Government at the preliminary hearing. (c) Report to convening authority - After a preliminary hearing under this Section, the hearing officer shall submit to convening authority a written report (accompanied by a recording of the preliminary hearing under Subsection (c) that includes the following: 32 U.S.C. Sec 101 Definitions united States Code 2022 edition Sec: 10 U.S.C. Sec 810 Article. 10 Restraint of persons charged (a) in General (1) subject to paragraph (2) any person subject to this chapter who is charged with an offense under the chapter may be orderd into arrest or confinement as circumstances require. (2) when a person subject to this chapter is charged with an offense that normality tried by summary court-martial, the person ordinerily shall not be ordered into confinement. (b) Notification To Accused and Related procedures (1) when a person subject to this chapter is ordered into arrest or confinement before trial Immediate steps shall be taken - Attorney Generals Manual on the Administrative procedure Act 14 (1947), and implicate the Due process interests of the individuals parties to the adjudication. Judicial Review of adjudication therefore ordinarily focuses on what happend during the agency's adjudication. A fundamental error exception must apply as recognized exception a requirement in which the record reflects to correct the procedural rule error that violated private constitutional rights. Joe Biden and Cabinet are responsible for conspiracy tax invasion orginated from stimulus fraudlent transfers involved administrative office of the united states courts engaged in departure from essential law requirements grounds for court-martial under 10 U.S.C. Sec. 832 Article 32.

Reasons For Granting The petition

Petititioner questions the propriety of a trial court on ground that he has been denied a speedy trial the exceptional circumstances warrant the exercise of the court's discretionary powers 34-5.002 Review for sufficiency of allegations of Breach of public Trust order of preliminary investigation. 28 U.S.C.S §455(a) provides: "Any Justice, Judge, or Magistrate Judge of united states shall disqualify himself in any proceeding in which his impartiality might reasonably questioned". If a reasonable observer aware of all circumstances would habor doubts about the Judges impartiality under applicable standards then the Judge must rescuse." Miller v. Hendricks, 282 Fed. Appx. 102

(2) Elements: In deciding whether a rescuse has been made with sufficient speed, a court should conside factors such as whether: (1) movant has participated in substantial manner in trial or pretrial proceedings; (2) granting would represent a waste of Judicial resources; (3) motion was made after entry of Judgement and (4) movant can demonstrate good cause for the delay. (3) Statutes and Rules: (1) 28 U.S.C.S. § 455, (2) 28 U.S.C.S. § 144. (4) Secondary Sources: (1) 9-5004 Collier on BanKruptcy p. 5004.01 (2) 12-63 Moores Federal pratices - civil § 63.20 (5) Burden of proof: A trial Judge must hear cases unless some reasonable factual basis to doubt the impartiality or fairness of the tribunal is shown by some Kind of probative evidence. Blizard v. Frechette, 601 F.2d 1217. (6) Standard of Review An Appellate court reviews a denial to recuse for an abuse of discretion. Am. prairie constr. co. v. Hoich, 594 F.3d 1015. upon issuance of the rule nisi, all proceedings in the trial court are stayed. Following a final decision by the court, the rule nisi is discharged, under Fla. App. R 4.5 (d)(2) if suggestions makes a prima facie case court will issue a rule directing the inferior court to show cause on a day certain Why the writ as prayed for should not issue; and such rule shall operate as a supersedas when the same has been issued and notice thereof given to respondent. unless the district court shall other wise direct for good cause shown after notice and hearing, a petition for certiorari filed in supreme court, decision or Judgement sought to be reviewed or within date of disposition of a petition for rehearing shall automatically stay futher proceedings in the district court and trial court until disposition of the petition by the supreme court Fla. App. 4.5(c)(6). See: 691-24.002, F.A.C. Definitions; construction entire subsections. Section 20.121, F.S. Rule making Authority: 17.29, 215.422(8) F.S. laws implemented: 215.422 F.S., Fla. R. civ. p. 1.180, Fla. R. civ. p. 1.070, Fla. R. civ. p. 1420, Fla. R. civ. p. 1.230, Fla. R. civ. p. 1.540, 28 U.S.C.S. § 1651, Fla. Stat. § 81.011, USCS const. Art. IV, § 2, cl2 Delivery of fugitives, USCS const. Amend. 12, USCS const. Art. 1 § 8, cl4 Naturalization - BanKruptcy.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Rule 9.020 Definitions (a) Administrative Action (1),(2),(3),(4) Employers Fire Ins. co v. Continental Ins. co., 326 so. 2d 177 Fla (1976) Jurisdiction see art. V § 2 (a) Fla. const. Rule 9.030 Jurisdiction of courts (1) Appeal Jurisdiction, (2) Discretionary Jurisdiction (B) orders and Judgements of trial courts certified by the district court of Appeals in which the appeals is pending to require immediate resolution by supreme court (i) To be of great public importance or (ii) To have a great effect on proper administration of Justice. petiton for writ of prohibition reviewable by certiorari united states supreme court should be primarily concerned with seriousness of error's mere existence of error departure from essential requirements of law is more then a legal error it is an act that resulted in gross miscarriage of Justice a departure with failure to apply correct law. See state v. Belvin, 986 so. 2d 516, 525 Fla (2008) quoting Belvin v. state 922 so. 2d 1046, 1048 (Fla 4th DCA 2006) Standard of review city of Miami v. Blanco, 2022 Fla. App. Lexis 2713. The trial court departed from the essential requirements of law by not conducting an survillence camera review of video camera recordings, Trial court could not determine whether Video survillence camera recordings fell within the security plan exemption under §§ 119.071(3)(a) and 281.301 Fla. Stat (2021) Judge Roy K. Altman failed to address evidence and answer questions of law in accordance with statutory requirement, See u.s.c. § 554(c)(2) makes provision § 7, 5 u.s.c. § 556 applicable to adjudicatory proceedings Jam v. united states 340 u.s. 593, 596, 71 s.ct. 515, 518, 95 L.Ed. 556 (1951) Section 5 u.s.c. § 533 Roy K. Altman failure to provide defendants reasonable notice summon and complaint times, dates, who served defendants is concrete invury gross departure from essential requirement of law that affected Justice and petitioner ability to procedurally effectively cross examine defendant See u.s.c. 6th and 14th Amend. steadman v. securities and exchange commission, 450 u.s. 91, 101 s. ct. 999, 67 L.Ed. 2d 69 (1981) quoting citizens to preserve overton park Inc v. Volpe 401 U.s. 402, 415, 91 s.ct. 814, 823, 28 L. Ed. 2d 136 (1971) see: 39 CFR § 952.7 Notice of docketing and answer reference subsection (a) to effect of failure to file answer and or assessment civil penalities authorized by 39 u.s.c. 3012. See §§ 952.10 and 952.11 (2) Direct Respondent to cease and desist from engaging in conduct warranting Issuance of order authorized 39 u.s.c. § 3005(a); subsection (b) 39 u.s.c. 3005(a) (1) set forth finding of facts and conclusions of law regarding question of law, 15 CFR 906.7 (a), (b), (c), 32 CFR § 776.84, Notice of action outlined in 776.81(b) of this subsection, 42 CFR § 93.519, 48 CFR § 1803.90 37 CFR § 11.804, 39 CFR § 951.6, charges served as provided § 951.5 (1) Does not possess qualifications required § 951.2 Louisiana power & light co. v. Thibodaux 360 u.s. 25 quoting Bank of N.Y. Mellon v. Jefferson county, 2009 u.s. Dist Lexis 122093 See: Cohens v. Virginia 19 u.s. 264*5 L.Ed 257. U.s. const. Art III, § 2 under the 25th section of the Judiciary act of 1789, c. 20. § 81.011 petiton for prohibition., 28 U.S.C.S § 1651 Part 1 of 2., Section 376 of title 28 u.s.c. 1940 ed.

Conclusion

The decision of a supreme court of a state construing and applying its own constitution and laws generally is binding upon the united states supreme court; but that is not so where the contract clause of the Federal constitution is involved. USCS Const. Art. 1, § 10, cl 1, part 1 of 2. Powers denied - Treaties - Money - Ex post facto laws - obligations of contracts. In that case, the court will give careful and respectful consideration and all due weight to the adjudication of the state court, but will determine independently thereof whether there be a contract, the obligation of which is within the protection of the contract clause, and whether that obligation has been impaired; and likewise, will determine for itself the meaning and application of state constitutional or statutory provisions said to create the contract or by which it is asserted an impairment has been effected. When a contractual obligation arises under a state constitutional provision, the right to enforce it becomes vested within protection of both the contract impairment clause in U.S. const. Art 1, § 10, and the due process law clause in the 14th Amend of Federal constitution. Honeywell, Inc v. Minnesota Life & Health ins. Guar. Ass'n, 110 F.3d 547 p. 556. The authority of a state under the reserved power to alter or amend laws relating to corporations does not extend to the destruction or impairment of vested property, rights or obligations of contracts of third persons. See Morris v. American public utilities, 122 Atl. 696; Apart from corpartion laws, rights of a contractual or quasi contractual nature that have arisen out of transactions authorized by statute may not be destoryed or impaired by subsequent repealing statues. Pacific Mail S. S. Co. v. Joliffe, 2 Wall. 450; Wasser v. Congregation Agudath Sholom, 262 Mass. 235. The legislature may restrict or revoke, at its pleasure, any of the powers of a municipal Corporation, but in doing so it may not impair the obligation of contracts. Van Hoffman v. Quincy, 4 Wall. 535; Wolff v. New Orleans, 103 U.S. 358. it may not impose unconstitutional conditions upon corporations or persons dealing with them. Ligget v. Balridge, 278 U.S. 104; Terral v. Burke construction co. 257 U.S. 529; San Mateo v. Southarn pacific Ry. co 13 Fed 722; Frost v. R.R. Commission, 271 U.S. 583. The reservation of power contained in § 1 of Art. XII of the state constitution justified repeal is untenable, because that Section is in pari materia § 16 of Art. 1 of the state constitution prohibiting the impairment of the obligation of contracts. Cf. Omaha water co. v. Omaha, 147 Fed. 1; Western union v. Hopkins, 160. Cal. 106.

Joe Biden and cabinet officer is responsible for concrete injury departure from necessary procedural law requirements refused to supervise monitor Judical and legislature policy makers. Joe Biden and cabinet officer engaged in administrative law agency failure to follow it own rules and procedures established thereby policy makers. Allege removal violations are entitled to injunctive relief and rewinding of agency action. Joe Bidens inability to remove an agency head affected rule making decisions, breached contract laws that conflicted with treaties and stipulations established in International law also International Commerce Collins v. yellen, 141 s.ct. 1761, 210 L.Ed. 2d 432 (2021) see terms and phrases in Federal Trade Commission Act states that any commissioner may be removed by president for inefficiency neglect of duty or malfeasance in office. Humphrey Ex v. united states, Rethbun v. same 295 u.s. 602, 55 s.ct. 869, 79 L.Ed. 1611 (1935) Joe Biden and cabinet engaged in unlawful employment pratices and regulations 43 u.s.c. § 1863 both Judical and legislative branches produced no evidence proof of what corrective action was taken. Congress should be held in contempt for unlawful pratices and concrete injury see The Hobbs Act 18 u.s.c § 1951 element 1) To prove offense of taking a bribe the government need only show that public offical obtained payment that was not entitled (2) Knowing that payment was made in return for offical acts. The general federal **CONCLUSION** Conspiracy statute makes it a crime to conspire to commit any offense against the united states 18 u.s.c.s § 371 section 371. United states v. Qia Chu 2017 u.s. Dist Lexis 208200, 2017 WL 6502393. united states v. Rhame 2017 u.s. Dist Lexis 192480. See: 31 u.s.c.s § 3729; 31 u.s.c.s § 3730(b); 31 u.s.c.s. § 3730(c)(1); 31 u.s.c.s § 3730(C)(2)(A); 31 u.s.c.s § 3730(c)(2)(B) False claim Act (31 uscs 3729 - 3733)

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Nathaniel Waugh

Date: 6- 22

No. ____________________

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

United states of America
Ex Rel Nathaniel Waugh — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

VS.

A. Ralph — RESPONDENT(S)

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Nathaniel Waugh, do swear or declare that on this date, July 21st, 20 22, as required by Supreme Court Rule 29 I have served the enclosed MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED *IN FORMA PAUPERIS* and PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI on each party to the above proceeding or that party's counsel, and on every other person required to be served, by depositing an envelope containing the above documents in the United States mail properly addressed to each of them and with first-class postage prepaid, or by delivery to a third-party commercial carrier for delivery within 3 calendar days.

The names and addresses of those served are as follows: Joe Biden, cabinet officer Roy K. Altman, Solicitor General, Attorney General 950 pennsylvania Ave., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20530-0001, White House 1600 pennsylvania N.W. Washington D.C. 20500, Walton corrections Institution A. Ralph Dept of corrections.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on July 21st, 20 22

(Signature)

Notary Public State of Florida
Punthika Robinson
My Commission
HH 248455
Exp. 4/1/2026