

No. _____

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

HAROLD L. WILBORN Pro Se

Petitioner

v.

ALEJANDRO N. MAYORKAS
United States Secretary
of Homeland Security

Respondent

Petition for a Writ of Certiorari
to the United States Court of Appeals
for the Ninth Circuit

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Harold L Wilborn Pro Se
15501 Harvard Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44128-2041
619-402-7975
harold.wilborn@sbcglobal.net

U.S. Court of Appeals
Ninth Circuit
James R. Browning
Courthouse
95 7th Street
San Francisco CA 94103

Solicitor General U.S.
Rm 5616, Dept. of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Counsel of Record Rule 34.1

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

The following Questions are to provide notice of the grounds Petitioner seeks certiorari and resolve questions of particular importance.

1. Whether procedural due process under the Fourth, Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments of the Constitution of the United States, denied by the District Court of Southern California and the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Southern California, are deprivation of a constitutionally protected liberty or property interest and a denial of adequate procedural protection.

2. Whether the Civil Rights Act of 1964, (Title VII), the Civil Service Reform (CSRA), or USERRA violations, provide removal of jurisdiction given to federal courts to precluded federal employees, under the circumstances of the case.

3. Whether this Supreme Court has subject matter jurisdiction of constitutional claims United States' has not waived sovereign immunity.

4. Whether failure to state a claim under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6) accepted as true warrant dismissal for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, without considering all allegations of material fact.

5. Whether dismissal with prejudice for failure to state claim under Title VII facially challenges the validity of the statute, under CSRA claimed by Respondent as the only original forum for this case.

6. Whether expunged EEOC case used to obstruct legitimate procedures for appealing personnel actions are fairly included herein.

**LIST OF ALL PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING IN THE COURT WHOS
JUDGMENT IS SOUGHT**

Caption of the case contain all parties and name, Rule 14.1(b)(i).

**LIST OF AL PROCEEDING IN STATE AND FREDERAL TRAIL AND
APPELLATE COURT, THAT ARE DIRECTLY RELATED TO THE CASE IN
THIS COURT**

1. Court in Question: U.S. Federal District Court for the Southern

District of California;

a. Case Docket Number: 3:20-cv-01981

b. Caption on the Proceeding: Wilborn v. Wolf

Date of entry: October 28, 2021.

2. Court in Question; U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

a. Case Docket Number 21-56391

Date of entry: August 26, 2022.

RULE 29.6(c) CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

**There is no parent company or publicly held company, in which
Petitioner, owns, 10% or more of the corporation's stock, structured as a
corporation, business, home or establishment. etc.**

TABLES OF AUTHORITIES

(Constitutional Provisions, Treaties, Statues, Rules and Regulations Involved)

CASES:	Page(s)
<u>Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics</u> , 403 U.S. 388, 91 S.Ct. 1999, 29 L.Ed.2d 619 (1971); 4 th Amend,9, 10, 11	
<u>Bryant v. Cheney</u> , 924 F.2d 525, 528 (4th Cir. 1991).....7	
<u>Cleveland Bd. Of Educ. v. Loudermill</u> , Supreme Court of the United States arch 19, 1985 470 U.S. 532 105 S.CT. 1487. 83-1487, 1362, 639212	
<u>Davis v. Passman</u> , 442 U.S. 228, 234, 99 S.Ct. 2264, 60 L.Ed.2d 846 (1979)	
<u>Dotson v. Griesa</u> , 398 F.3d 156, 179-82 (2d Cir. 2005); 7	
<u>Elgin v. U.S. Dep't of Treasury</u> , 641 F.3d 6, 11-13 (1st Cir. 2011);.....7	
<u>Gagnon v. Sprint Corp.</u> , 284 F.3d 839, 853 (8th Cir.2002)	14
<u>Hardison v. Cohen</u> , 375 F.3d 1262, 1266-67 (11th Cir. 2004).”.....7	
<u>Harper v. United States Dep't of Interior</u>7 2 United States District Court, D. Idaho November 12, 2021 571 F.Supp.3d 1147 116 Fed. R. Evid. Serv. 1924	
<u>Ickes v. Fox</u> , 300 U.S. 82, 57 S.Ct. 412, 81 L.Ed. 525 (1937);.....10	
<u>Lombardi v. Small Business Admin.</u> , 889 F.2d 959, 961-62 (10th Cir. 1989).....7	
<u>Jackson v. Carey</u> , 353 F.3d 750, 758 (9th Cir. 2003).	
<u>Land v. Dollar</u> , 330 U.S. 731, 67 S.Ct. 1009, 91 L.Ed. 1209 (1947);	10
<u>Lombardi v. Small Business Admin.</u> , 889 F.2d 959, 961-62 (10th Cir. 1989)	
<u>Munoz v. Mabus</u> , 630 F.3d 856, 861 (9th Cir. 2010) (“Section 717 of Title VII	
<u>Paige v. Cisneros</u> , 91 F.3d 40, 44 (7th Cir.1996);.....7	
<u>Petersen v. Department of Interior Merit Systems Protection Board</u>14 July 19, 1996 71 M.S.P.R. 227.	

<i>Pennsylvania State Police v. Suders</i> , 542 U.S. 129, 141, 124 S.Ct.....14 2342, 159 L.Ed.2d 204 (2004)	
<i>Saul v. United States</i> , 928 F.2d 829, 843 (9th Cir.1991).....8	
<i>University of Texas Southwestern Medical v. Nassar</i> Supreme Court of the United States June 24, 2013 570 U.S. 338133 S.Ct. 2517186 L.Ed.2d 503".... 4	
<i>Wallace v. City of San Diego</i> United States Court of Appeals,14 Ninth Circuit .February 12, 2007479 F.3d 616.	
<i>Webster v. Doe</i> , 486 U.S. 592, 603, 108 S.Ct. 2047,8 100 L.Ed.2d 632 (1977))	
<i>Wheeler v. Terrible Herbst Inc.</i> U.S. Court of Appeals, Ninth (9 th) Circuit, November 19, 2012 498 Fed. Appx. 707.....3 2012 WL 5857425	
<i>Wilkie v. Robbins</i> , 551 U.S. 537, 127 S.Ct. 2588, 168 L.Ed.2d 389 (2007).....9	
<i>Whitman v. Dep't of Transportation</i> , 547 U.S. 512, 513-14, 126 S.Ct.....8 12 2014, 164 L.Ed.2d 771 (2006)	
<i>Work v. Louisiana</i> , 269 U.S. 250, 46 S.Ct. 92, 70 L.Ed. 259 (1925);”.....10	

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS	Page(s)
Bill of Rights and America's Declaration	12
Section 1&2 of Article III of the Constitution.....	1
STATUTES	Page(s)
Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967.....4, 5 (Pub. L. 90-202) (ADEA), as amended,	
Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Pub. L. 88-352).....	7
(Title VII), as amended.	
	Pages

TABLE OF CONTENTS Rule 14.1(c)

	Pages
QUESTIONS PRESENTED.....	i
LIST OF ALL PARTIES TO PROCEEDINGS.....	ii
RULE 29.6 STATEMENT	iii
TABLE OF AUTHORTIES.....	iv-viii
TABLE OF CONTENT	ix
OPINIONS FROM BELOW.....	1-18
JURISDICTION	19
STATEMENT OF CASE	20-25
A. Factual Background	20
B. Court of Appeals Decision (Memorandum)	21
C. Procedure of District Court.....	21
D. Waiver of Sovereign Immunity by Congress Under Title VII. 22	22
E. Abuse of Discretion, District Court.....	22
F. Expunged EEOC Decision Used as Retaliation While in the EEOC Process of Appeal	23-25
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION.....	26-32
A. Question Presented Is A Recurring One Of Great.....-28-26 Importance	28-26
B. The Case Is An Ideal Vehicle for Deciding The Question. . 29-33	29-33
CONCLUSION.....	34
APPENDIX A:MEMORANDM of the Court of Appeals (Aug. 26, 2022). 1a	1a
APPENDIX B:MANDATE of the Court of Appeals (Oct. 18, 2022)..... 4a	4a
APPENDIX C:... Granting Motion To Dismiss Plaintiff's..... 5a Amended Complaint [Dkt 42] District Court (Excerpts)	5a
APPENDIX D:Original Complaint in District Court (Oct. 06 th , 2020)....7a	7a
APPENDIX E:Amended Complaint in District Court (Apr. 28 th , 2021)..11a	11a

CITATIONS OF OPINIONS BELOW Rule 14.1(d)

APPENDEX

APPENDIX A: **Memorandum(opinion) of the Court of Appeals**
(Submitted Aug. 17, 2022, Filed Aug. 26, 2022)1a-3a

APPENDIX B: **Court of Appeals Mandate Filed (Oct. 18, 2022)** 4a

APPENDIX C: **Order of the District Court (Oct. 28, 2021).....** 5a-6a

APPENDIX D: **Original Complaint District Court Case (Excerpts)**
No. '3:20-cv-01981'(Oct. 07, 2020).....7a-10a

APPENDIX E; **Amended Complaint District Court (Apr. 28, 2021)**
(Excerpts).....11a-13a

JURISDICTION

Above titled section is intended to provides a brief preliminary statement of the basic jurisdictional facts.

Statutory source of Courts jurisdiction: Rule 14.1(e)(i) & (iv), 14(g)(i)-(ii) providing for inclusion of other jurisdictional material in the Statement of Case. No statement of notification required 14.1(e)(v), by 29.4(b) or (c).

Judgement of the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was entered April 26th, 2022, submitted August 17th, 2022 , No. 21-56391 on Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of California; No. 3:20-cv-01981, from the Final Agency Decision of the U.S. Dept. of Homeland Security August 31, 2015; Agency Case No. HS-CBP-01763-2014 and U.S Equal Employment Opportunity Commissions, Decision July 14th, 2020; Appeal No. 0120182404, Rule 14.1(b)(iii). now and previously naming the head of the Petitioners agency as the appropriate defendant, in all cases above. 42 § 2000e-5, & § 2000e-16(c).

Jurisdiction of this Court is preyed to be invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1), 28 U.S.C. §2101(c), Section 1&2 of Article III of the Constitution.

Standing invoked in Article III judicial power to decide only these cases, within and actual controversies, that the Supreme court can exercise its jurisdiction to determine the constitutionality of federal...and executive acts in the context of adjudging “legal rights of litigants in actual controversies.” *Liverpool S.S. Co. v. Commissions of Emigration*, 113 U.S. 33, 39 (1885).

STATEMENT OF THE CASE Rule 14.1(g)

Rule 14.1(g) calls for the inclusion in the petition for certiorari of a concise statement of the case setting out the facts material to consideration of the Questions present.

Rule 14.1(g)(ii) provides “[i]f review of a judgement of a United States court of appeals is sought,” the statement of the case shall also show “basis for federal jurisdiction in the court of first instance.

A. Factual Background

Court of Appeals jurisdiction.

The jurisdiction of the district court was entitled by Petitioner to invoke jurisdiction of Federal District Court being cited on face of complaint and amendments support alleging actions under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended by the Equal Employment Opportunity Act 1972, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e et seq., Notice of Right to Sue, authority granting him permission to file a lawsuit to be enforced in federal court, Title VII's own venue provision (42 U.S.C. § 2000e-5(f)(3), federal venue statute generally applies when the court's subject matter jurisdiction is based on federal question or diversity jurisdiction (28 U.S.C. § 251391(a)(1)), 42 U.S. Code§ 2000e-3(a)'s "because of Retaliation, Fourth, Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments of Constitution, 42 U.S. Code§ 2000e-3(a)'s "because of Retaliation. And or 28 U.S.C. 1331 (General federal question jurisdiction).

Petitioner attempts to present a concise statement of the case's factual material questions, intending Statement of Case to be a short document.

B. Court of Appeals Decision (Memorandum)

On August 26th, 2022 U.S. Court of Appeals for Ninth (9th) Circuit entered its Memorandum, Affirming portions of the U.S. District Court of Southern California, district court's, Dismissal with Prejudice and without leave to amend of Petitioners based on failure to state a viable claim and Appeals court jurisdiction "dismissal under Fed. R. Civ. 12(b)(6) failure to state a claim explaining 12(b)(6) under 12(b)(1) case (subject matter jurisdiction) possible plain error. Harper v. United States Dep't of Interior United States District Court, D. Idaho November 12, 2021 571 F.Supp.3d 1147 116 Fed. R. Evid. Serv. 1924. The court will dismiss a complaint without leave to amend only when the deficiencies in the complaint could not be cured by amendment.

C. Procedures of District Court

Petitioner questions procedural due process review where the district court did not represent its jurisdiction to dismissal, denial of motion access under its Civil Rules 7.1, by perjury stating procedure under Civ.R. not undertaken; seen as obstruction or impeding of justice under color of law (oath) – Conduct: producing or attempting to produce a false, altered or counterfeit (material)document or record during an judicial proceeding.

D. Waiver of Sovereign Immunity by Congress Under Title VII

U.S. Attorney's office defended district court as its client while not stating any comment towards their same conduct to falsify case law.,. obstructing or impeding due administration of justice. SD § 3C1.1 Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments: substantive and procedural due process.

Sovereign immunity has been waved by Congress under Title VII;

- a. Other material essential to understanding the petition for review is Title VII waives the federal government's sovereign immunity with respect to lawsuits brought by federal employees (or applicants for federal employment) against their (current or prospective or former) employers alleging employment discrimination or retaliation by those employers. 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-16(c); see **Munoz v. Mabus**, 630 F.3d 856, 861 (9th Cir. 2010) ("Section 717 of Title VII ... provides an express waiver of sovereign immunity in suits against the government for discriminatory employment practices."). No. 13-1196 IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIRST WAXING V. WANG, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. EEOC, Defendant-Appellee On Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts (No. 12-10740).

E. Abuse of Discretion

Court of Appeals held that: dismissal of action for failure to state a claim, with prejudice and with opportunity to amend complaint, was abuse of discretion, and (2) dismissal of action with prejudice for failure to comply with court order or local rule was an "abuse of discretion Wheeler v.

Terrible Herbst Inc. U.S. Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit, November 19, 2012 498 Fed. Appx. 707 2012 WL 5857425. After seven (7) months of attempted amendments based on clerical and local rule mistakes, approval of amended complaint was granted, dismissed without permission to amend, after one single approved complaint.

**F. Expunged EEOC Decision Used as Retaliation
While in the EEOC Process of Appeal**

Appeals courts presents that “the district court properly dismissed Wilborn’s (Petitioners) retaliation claim because Wilborn failed to allege facts sufficient to show there was a causal relationship between any protected activity and a materially adverse employment action

“The text, structure, and history of Title VII demonstrate that a plaintiff making a retaliation claim under § 2000e-3(a) must establish that his or her protected activity was a “because of” cause of the alleged adverse action by the employer. That question, of “because of” or “but for”, is better suited to resolution by courts closer to the facts of this case. The judgment of the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was vacated, and the case remanded for further proceedings consistent with this opinion. University of Texas Southwestern Medical v. Nassar Supreme Court of the United States June 24, 2013 570 U.S. 338133 S.Ct. 2517186 L.Ed.2d 503”

In Petitioner v. Dep’t of Interior, EEOC Petition No. 0320110050, July 16, 2014, the Commission found that the “but for” standard discussed in Nassar does not apply to retaliation claims by federal sector applicants or employees under Title VII or ADEA because the relevant federal sector statutory language does not contain the “because of”

language on which the Supreme Court based its holding in Nassar. . .(requiring but for" causation for ADEA claims. . .")

Petitioner v. Dep't of in Interior, *supra*, the Commission clarified the causation standard for retaliation claims und Title VII or ADEA for federal sector applicants or employees that being "because of" statutory language.,

Plaintiff believes the legal standard for Agency's unlawful discriminatory action is Title VII prohibition against employers from discriminating against any of employee, . . .AMENDED COMPLAINT 20-cv-01981-LAB (BGS) Case 3:20-cv-01981-LAB-BGS Document 28 Filed 04/28/21

PageID.1821 Page 26- 27 "...because such employees have opposed any employment practice made unlawful by Title VII or *because* an employee has made a charge or participated in any manner in an investigation, proceeding or hearing under Title VII, 42 USC Section 2000e-3(a).

"The Agency shall expunge all evidence of Complainant's (5 day) suspension from his personnel file and all other Agency files." Aug. 20th, 2013." Case 3:20-cv-01981-LAB-BGS Document 1-2 Filed 10/07/20 PageID.66 Page 60 of 65, Lines 18-20" Because of Agency using this evidence, in violation of EEOC Administrative Judges ORDER, the Petitioner was retaliated against and issue January 30th, 2015 disciplinary order using the five day suspension to support agency action. This while Petitioner was still in the EEOC process not resolved until May 23rd, 2015; EEOC Appeal No. 0720140037, agency No. HSCBP006542010.

Statement of Case present in length as Appeals court presented five (5) statements, causes of action, requiring answers and questions regarding Statement of Case document.

REASONS FOR GRANTING WRIT(PETITION)

Rule 10: Consideration Governing Review of Certiorari

Petitioner believes “review on writ of certiorari is not a matter of right, but of judicial discretion. The following although neither controlling nor fully measuring the Court’s discretion, indicate the character of the reasons the Court considers:” Conflict Between Decisions of Same Court of Appeals; Decisional Conflicts.

- (a) United States court of appeals has entered a decision in conflict with decision(s) of another United States court of appeal on the same important matter; has decided an important federal question in a way that. . .so far departed from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings, or sanctioned such a departure by a lower court, as to call for an exercise of this Courts supervisory power . . .(c) . . . or a United States court of appeal has decided an important question of federal law that has not been, but should be, settled by this court or has decided an important federal question in a way that conflicts with relevant decisions of this Court,”

“There is a (wide spread) *Circuit split* on this issue, as the First, Second, and Tenth Circuits have held the CSRA precludes constitutional claims seeking equitable relief. See Elgin v. U.S. Dep't of Treasury, 641 F.3d 6, 11–13 (1st Cir. 2011); Dotson v. Griesa, 398 F.3d 156, 179–82 (2d Cir. 2005); Lombardi v. Small Business Admin., 889 F.2d 959, 961–62 (10th Cir. 1989). But see Elgin, 641 F.3d at 13–18 (Stahl, J., concurring). The Fourth, Seventh, and Eleventh Circuits have left the question open. See Bryant v. Cheney, 924 F.2d 525, 528 (4th Cir. 1991); Paige v. Cisneros, 91 F.3d 40, 44 (7th Cir. 1996); Hardison v. Cohen, 375 F.3d 1262, 1266–67 (11th Cir. 2004).” Harper v. United States Dep't of interior, United States

District Court, D. Idaho. November 12, 2021571
F.Supp.3d 1147 116 Fed. R. Evid. Serv. 1924,
Footnote 11. 48 word count

These decisions have been left open invalidating acts of Congress.

A nationally binding rule is imperative not the the petitioner has suffered an individual injustice. Exampled Equal Employment Opportunity Commission will have to decide where a complaint such as the Petitioner will have to have his case decided, changing the present procedure on merit. Effect would be nationwide., changing the procedure on retaliation. The district court has presented. . . “an alternative remedy (to EEOC) is available through the Civil Service Reform Act (“CSRA”), which precludes Wilborn from bringing a private cause of action, in this case. Saul v. United States, 928 F.2d 829, 843 (9th Cir.1991), Case 3:20-cv-01981-LAB-BGS Document 50 Filed 10/28/21 PageID.1948 Page 6

Claims for equitable relief present a federal question that is not precluded by the CSRA and can be addressed by this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331.

Id. at 1035 (quoting Webster v. Doe, 486 U.S. 592, 603, 108 S.Ct. 2047, 100 L.Ed.2d 632 (1977)) (internal quotation marks omitted); see also Whitman v. Dep't of Transportation, 547 U.S. 512, 513–14, 126 S.Ct. 2014, 164 L.Ed.2d 771 (2006) (per curiam) (in vacating and remanding to the Ninth Circuit, the Supreme Court held “The Court of Appeals was correct to say that 5 U.S.C. § 7121(a)(1) [of the CSRA] does not confer jurisdiction. Another statute,

however—a very familiar one—grants jurisdiction to the federal courts over ‘all civil actions arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States.’ 28 U.S.C. § 1331. The question, then, is not whether 5 U.S.C. § 7121 confers jurisdiction, but whether § 7121 (or the CSRA as a whole) removes the jurisdiction granted to the federal courts”). *Ibid Harper* 1167.

Supreme Court recognized Bivens claims for violations of the Fourth, Fifth, and Eighth Amendments. See Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, 403 U.S. 388, 91 S.Ct. 1999, 29 L.Ed.2d 619 (1971); (Fourth Amendment); Davis v. Passman, 442 U.S. 228, 234, 99 S.Ct. 2264, 60 L.Ed.2d 846 (1979). (Fifth Amendment)

CSRA does not preclude actions seeking equitable relief for constitutional violations) there is a two-part test for courts to employ when deciding whether a Bivens claim may proceed in a new context.⁷ See Wilkie v. Robbins, 551 U.S. 537, 127 S.Ct. 2588, 168 L.Ed.2d 389 (2007).

The first question the court must answer is “whether any alternative, existing process for protecting the interest amounts to a convincing reason for the Judicial Branch to refrain from providing a new and freestanding remedy in damages.”

The second prong requires that a court analyze “any special factors counselling hesitation before authorizing a new kind of federal litigation,” even in the absence of an alternative remedy.

Under Title VII, which Petitioner filed this case after exhaustion of EEOC administrative action Petitioners constitutional claims are not barred where CSRA does not preempt Title VII, as previously stated, Congress, this Supreme Court, and 9th Cir. represent the following:

- a. Title VII waives the federal government's sovereign immunity with respect to lawsuits brought by federal employees (or applicants for federal employment) against their (current or prospective or former) employers alleging employment discrimination or retaliation by those employers. 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-16(c); see *Munoz v. Mabus*, 630 F.3d 856, 861 (9th Cir. 2010) ("Section 717 of Title VII ... provides an express waiver of sovereign immunity in suits against the government for discriminatory employment practices."). No. 13-1196 IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIRST WAXING V. WANG, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. EEOC, Defendant-Appellee On Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts (No. 12-10740).
- b. Cases construing the sovereign immunity of the Federal Government also hold that conduct by federal officers forbidden by statute is not shielded by sovereign immunity even though the officer is not acting completely beyond his authority. See *Land v. Dollar*, 330 U.S. 731, 67 S.Ct. 1009, 91 L.Ed. 1209 (1947); *Ickes v. Fox*, 300 U.S. 82, 57 S.Ct. 412, 81 L.Ed. 525 (1937); *Work v. Louisiana*, 269 U.S. 250, 46 S.Ct. 92, 70 L.Ed. 259 (1925);"

Personnel actions preclusion in this, case before this Court were the use of expunged case information to support proposal for disciplinary action while the matter was still on appeal in EEOC proceedings. Not personnel action so Bivens not precluded.

Nor was the use of the proposal ever stated to be initiated or improving the efficiency of the agency, rather just an action against the Petitioner.

In the context of the CSRA, which has been held to be a special factor counseling against recognizing a new Bivens claim, see Saul v. United States, 928 F. 2d 829, 840 (9th Cir. 1991), the Ninth Circuit has stated;

[T]he CSRA precludes even those Bivens claims for which the act prescribes no alternative remedy. The CSRA's comprehensive remedial provisions convince us that there was no inadvertence by Congress in omitting a damages remedy against.

The CSRA does not preclude non-personnel actions taken by federal employees against their subordinates. Id. at 1078, 1080 (holding that illegal search of employee's home was not a personnel action so Bivens claim was not precluded).

CSRA does not provide the "black letter" law that Title VII was given by Congress., that is and we quote:

"Unlawful Employment Practices"
SEC. 2000e-2. [Section 703],
(a) Employment practices
It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer-
(n) Resolution of Challenges to employment practices
implementing litigated or consent judgements, or orders...
(2) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to-(D)
authorize or permit the denial to any person the due process of law required by the Constitution."

CSRA does not provide this guarantee and not preempting Title VII., in this matter before the Supreme Court, by the Constitution., it would deny due process where the statue does not secure due process as Title VII does. In vacating and remanding to the Ninth Circuit, the Supreme Court held “The Court of Appeals was correct to say that 5 U.S.C. § 7121(a)(1) [of the CSRA] does not confer jurisdiction. Another statute, however—a very familiar one—grants jurisdiction to the federal courts over ‘all civil actions arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States.’ 28 U.S.C. § 1331. The question, then, is not whether 5 U.S.C. § 7121 confers jurisdiction, but whether § 7121 (or the CSRA as a whole) removes the jurisdiction granted to the federal courts”). *Webster v. Doe*, 486 U.S. 592, 603, 108 S.Ct. 2047, 100 L.Ed.2d 632 (1977)) (internal quotation marks omitted); see also *Whitman v. Dep't of Transportation*, 547 U.S. 512, 513–14, 126 S.Ct. 2014, 164 L.Ed.2d 771 (2006).

Finally the right to due process is believed conferred, not by legislative grace, but by constitutional guarantee. *Cleveland Bd. Of Educ. v. Loudermill*, Supreme Court of the United States arch 19, 1985 470 U.S. 532 105 S.CT. 1487. 83-1487, 1362, 6392. Again Title VII constitutional guarantee of due process is promised by CSRA and the Petitioner has presented jurisdiction to the district court, court of appeals and now to this Supreme Court as the Bill of Rights and America’s Declaration of the People’s Unalienable Civil Liberties.

Petitioner has continually presented claims of discrimination, retaliation and denial of benefits.. ."benefit of medical leave due Plaintiff's veteran military disability, was denied. Case 3:20-cv-01981-LAB-BGS Document 1 Filed 10/07/20 PageID 3 . . *Petersen v. Department of Interior Merit Systems Protection Board*. July 19, 1996 71 M.S.P.R. 227.

Defendants basing sovereign immunity, 38 §§ 4301(3)(c)(2), 38 U.S.C. § 4311(a)(b). 38 U.S.C. § 4324, 38 U.S.C. § 4327 . . . inapplicability of statutes of limitations.

Petitioner's claims are factual and sufficiently legal contrary to district courts determinations.

Although the term "retaliation" is not used in USERRA, the gravamen of this section is to prohibit adverse employment actions taken in retaliation for the exercise of the rights provided by USERRA. See Gagnon v. Sprint Corp., 284 F.3d 839, 853 (8th Cir.2002) (Section 4311(b) sets out "[t]he USERRA standard for retaliation claims"). Wallace v. City of San Diego United States Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit. February 12, 2007 479 F.3d 616.

Where a plaintiff alleges constructive discharge in violation of a federal statute, constructive discharge is governed by a federal standard. See Pennsylvania State Police v. Suders, 542 U.S. 129, 141, 124 S.Ct. 2342, 159 L.Ed.2d 204 (2004) (setting out standard for constructive discharge under Title VII). *Ibid* Wallace Footnote 1 & 2.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, this petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Dated: November 18, 2022

Harold L. Wilborn

Respectfully submitted,

Harold L. Wilborn Pro Se
Petitioner

15501 Harvard Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44128-2041
619.402.7975
harold.wilborn@sbcglobal.net

APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENT

- APPENDIX A:** **MEMORANDUM of the Court of Appeals (Aug. 26, 2022)**
- APPENDIX B:** **MANDATE of the Court of Appeals (Oct. 18, 2022)**
- APPENDIX C:** **“... Granting Motion To Dismiss Plaintiff’s Amended Complaint [Dkt 42] District Court (Excerpts)**
- APPENDIX D:** **Original Complaint in District Court (Oct. 06th, 2020)**
- APPENDIX E:** **Amended Complaint in District Court (Apr. 28th, 2021)**

APPPENIX

	Page
APPENDIX A: MEMORANDUM of the Court of Appeals	1a
(Aug. 26, 2022)	
APPENDIX B: MANDATE of the Court of Appeals	4a
(Oct. 18, 2022)	
APPENDIX C: “... Granting Motion To Dismiss Plaintiff's	5a
Amended Complaint [Dkt 42] District Court (Excerpts)	
APPENDIX: Original Complaint District Court.....	7a
APPENDIX E: Amended Complaint in District Court	11a
(Apr. 28 th , 2021)	

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

AUG 26 2022
MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

HAROLD L. WILBORN,

No. 21-56391

Plaintiff-Appellant,

D.C. No. 3:20-cv-01981-LAB-BGS

v.

ALEJANDRO N. MAYORKAS,

MEMORANDUM*

Defendant-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of California
Larry A. Burns, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted August 17, 2022**

Before: S.R. THOMAS, PAEZ, and LEE, Circuit Judges.

Harold L. Wilborn appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his employment action alleging various constitutional and Title VII violations. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo.

Cholla Ready Mix, Inc. v. Civish, 382 F.3d 969, 973 (9th Cir. 2004) (dismissal

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

** The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6)); *Sommatino v. United States*, 255 F.3d 704, 707 (9th Cir. 2001) (subject matter jurisdiction). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Wilborn's constitutional claims as barred by sovereign immunity and because the Civil Service Reform Act precludes him from "seeking injunctive relief for his asserted constitutional injury just as it precludes him from bringing a *Bivens* action for damages." *Saul v. United States*, 928 F.2d 829, 843 (9th Cir. 1991); *Gilbert v. DaGrossa*, 756 F.2d 1455, 1458 (9th Cir. 1985) (stating that the United States is immune from suit unless it has expressly waived its sovereign immunity, and "sovereign immunity cannot be avoided by naming officers and employees of the United States as defendants").

The district court properly dismissed Wilborn's Title VII retaliation claim because Wilborn failed to allege facts sufficient to show there was a causal relationship between any protected activity and a materially adverse employment action. *See Vasquez v. County of Los Angeles*, 349 F.3d 634, 642, 646 (9th Cir. 2003) (setting forth elements of Title VII retaliation claim and explaining what constitutes an adverse employment action).

The district court did not abuse its discretion by denying Wilborn's request for leave to file a sur-reply opposing defendant's motion to dismiss because Wilborn did not raise any new evidence or new arguments. *See Preminger v. Peake*, 552 F.3d 757, 769 n.11 (9th Cir. 2008) (standard of review for a district

court's decisions concerning its management of litigation).

We reject as unsupported by the record Wilborn's contentions that the district court was biased against him and that he was denied due process.

We do not consider matters not specifically and distinctly raised and argued in the opening brief, or arguments or allegations raised for the first time on appeal.

See Padgett v. Wright, 587 F.3d 983, 985 n.2 (9th Cir. 2009).

AFFIRMED.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

OCT 18 2022

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

HAROLD L. WILBORN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

ALEJANDRO N. MAYORKAS,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 21-56391

D.C. No. 3:20-cv-01981-LAB-BGS
U.S. District Court for Southern
California, San Diego

MANDATE

The judgment of this Court, entered August 26, 2022, takes effect this date.

This constitutes the formal mandate of this Court issued pursuant to Rule
41(a) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.

FOR THE COURT:

MOLLY C. DWYER
CLERK OF COURT

By: Nixon Antonio Callejas Morales
Deputy Clerk
Ninth Circuit Rule 27-7

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

HAROLD L. WILBORN

Plaintiff,

v.

ALEJANDRO MAYORKAS

Defendant.

Case No.: 20cv1981-LAB (BGS)

ORDER:

**(1) DENYING EX-PARTE MOTION
TO FILE SUR-REPLY [DKT. 49];
AND**

**(2) GRANTING MOTION TO
DISMISS PLAINTIFF'S AMENDED
COMPLAINT [Dkt. 42]**

Plaintiff Harold L. Wilborn, proceeding *pro se*, is a former employee of the U.S. Custom and Border Patrol law enforcement agency ("CBP"). He brings this suit against the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, Defendant Alejandro Mayorkas ("Defendant" or "Secretary Mayorkas"), for alleged violations of the Fourth, Fifth, and Fourteenth Amendments of the U.S. Constitution and for alleged violations of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 ("Title VII"). Wilborn claims that during his tenure with CBP, he was subjected to denials of due process, social discrimination, hostile work environment, retaliation, and constructive discharge.

1 **IV. CONCLUSION**

2 Plaintiff's request to file a sur-reply is **DENIED** and Defendant's Motion to
3 Dismiss is **GRANTED**. The Court recognizes that in civil rights cases, *pro se*
4 plaintiffs should be afforded an opportunity to amend a complaint before the
5 complaint is dismissed in its entirety, unless "it is absolutely clear that the
6 deficiencies of the complaint could not be cured by amendment." *Rodriguez v.*
7 *Chandler*, 86 F.3d 1163 (9th Cir. 1996) (citing *Noll v. Carlson*, 809 F.2d 1446, 1448
8 (9th Cir. 1987)). In this case, the Court previously provided Wilborn an opportunity
9 to amend these pleadings and correct the deficiencies identified by Defendant in
10 its motion to dismiss the original Complaint, but to no avail. The current amended
11 complaint still fails to state viable causes of action against Defendant and includes
12 only vague, conclusory, and confusingly-pled statements of Defendant's alleged
13 wrongdoing. Because Wilborn has previously amended his complaint but has yet
14 again failed to state any viable claims against Defendant, Wilborn's claims are
15 **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE** and without leave to amend.

16 The Clerk of Court is ordered to terminate this case.

17 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

18 Dated: October 28, 2021

19 
20 _____
21 Honorable Larry Alan Burns
22 United States District Judge
23
24
25
26
27
28

ORIGINAL

1 Name: Harold L. Wilborn
2 Address: 15501 Harvard Avenue
3 Telephone Phone: (619) 402-7975
4 Email: harold.wilborn@sbcglobal.net
5
6
7

8
9 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
10 **SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

11
12 Harold L. Wilborn
13 Plaintiff(s),
14 v.
15 Chad F. Wolf
16 Acting Secretary
17 Department of Homeland Security
18 Agency
19 Defendant(s).

Case No.: **'20CV1981 LAB BGS**
(assigned at time of filing)

COMPLAINT

Employment Discrimination and Retaliation in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Title VII), as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e et seq., Section 501 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Rehabilitation Act), as amended, 29 U.S.C. § 791 et seq., and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (ADEA), as amended, 29 U.S.C. § 621 et seq. Failure to Comply with the Uniform Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994, (USERRA, Pub.L. 103-335, codified as amended at 38 U.S.C. 4301-4335). Plaintiffs leave being a "benefit" under USERRA and 5 U.S.C. Code § 7703. Judicial review on the merits.
All filing fees are requested to be determined under USERRA, NO court cost provision.

20 **I. RELATED CASES**

21 a. Do you have other Civil Case(s) in this or any other federal court?

22 Yes No

23 b. If yes, please list the case numbers here:

24
25 **II. STATEMENT OF CLAIM** (*Briefly state the facts of your case. Describe how*
26 *each defendant is involved, and tell what each defendant did to you that caused*
27 *you to file this suit against them. Include names of any other persons involved,*
28 *dates, and places.*)

ORIGINAL

1 Plaintiff Pro Se wises to state as briefly as possible the facts showing that he is
2 entitled to the damages or other relief sought., as to how the defendant heading and
3 in charge of the United States Department of Homeland Security, DHS, Agency,
4 Chad F. Wolf, Acting Secretary of DHS, was involved and what the defendant did
5 that caused the Plaintiff harm or violated the Plaintiffs rights, including the dates
6 and places of that involvement or conduct.
7

8 The Plaintiff has shown that the Agency subjected him to a hostile workings
9 environment and discriminated against him on the bases of his protected
10 class and in reprisal; retaliating against him for his previous Equal Employment
11 Opportunity, EEOC, activity and complaints,while in the middle of the EEOC
12 process. These violations occurring between May 10, 2013 and
13 January 31st 2015, the Agency never deciding these matters on the merits.
14

15 On October 9, 2014, Complainant filed an EEO complaint alleging that the
16 Agency subjected him to a hostile work environment and discriminated against
17 him on the bases of race (African American), disability (disabled veteran), age
18 (64), and reprisal for prior protected EEO activity. Please see attached EEOC
19 Appellate Decision of 07/14/2020.
20

- 21 1. on October 3, 2014, the Agency issued Complainant a proposal to suspend
22 him from duty without pay for 10 calendar days; using previous EEOC cases
23 as justification. Final decision January 30, 2015. Please see attached.
- 24 2. on January 12, 2015, Supervisor requested that Complainant provide medical
25 verification in order to grant Complainant's request for sick leave a first time
26 of such a request after nearly 30 years of government service as a disabled
27 military veteran with the Agency.
- 28 3. effective January 31, 2015, the Agency forced Complainant to resign from
the Agency (constructive discharge).²

1 **III. RELIEF YOU REQUEST** (*State exactly what you want the court to do for you.*
2 *Do not use this space to state the facts of your claim.*)

3 Plaintiff Pro states briefly what damages or other relief he asks the court to
4 order not intending to make legal arguments. Included are the amounts of any
5 actual damages claimed for the acts alleged and any punitive or exemplary
6 damages claimed, the amounts, and the reasons Plaintiff claims he maybe
7 entitled to actual or punitive money damages.

8
9 A part of the claim of retaliation (the prima facie case) the Plaintiff states that
10 the employers conduct was materially adverse and may have well dissuaded a
11 reasonable military veteran worker from making or supporting a charge of
12 discrimination under USERRA's which prohibit discrimination against persons
13 because of their service in the uniformed services. Here the benefit of medical
14 leave, due to Plaintiff's veterans military disability, was denied.

15
16 Plaintiff, has a right or benefit provided under USERRA, to this leave, If any
17 other disabled veteran of DHS was granted this sick leave, to go to the Veterans
18 Administration hospital and his private physician; both of whom recommended
19 further sick leave, by reasonable demonstration, the Plaintiff has been
20 discriminated against and lost benefits under USERRA.

21
22 The Plaintiff asks the court for awards of \$450,000 in front and backpay,
23 \$175,000 in economic and non-economic damages, and punitive damages of
24 \$300,000 under relief as per Title VII.

25
26 This to include damages for the Agency's wrongful use of previous EEOC
27 case(s), this in proposing to suspend the Plaintiff for 10 calendar days on
28 October 03, 2014, leading to his forced retirement on January 31, 2015.

Other relief requested as the court finds lawful.

1 **IV. DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL** (*Would you like a trial by jury on all claims*
2 *pursuant to FRCP, Rule 38?*)

3 Yes No

4

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

6 October 06, 2020

7 Date

Harold L. Wilborn

Signature

8 Harold L. Wilborn

9 Printed Name

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 Harold L. Wilborn
15501 Harvard Avenue
2 Cleveland, Ohio 44128-2041
Phone: 1.619.402.7975
3 Email: harold.wilborn@sbcglobal.net

4 Harold L. Wilborn IN PRO PER
5

7
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

11 HAROLD L. WILBORN
12 PLAINTIFF
13 vs.

15
16 ALEJANDRO MAYORKAS
17 UNITED STATES SECRETARY OF
18 HOMELAND SECURITY, (CUSTOMS
19 AND BORDER PROTECTION,
BORDER PATROL)

20 DEFENDANT
21
22

CASE NO.: '20-cv-01981-LAB-BGS'

AMENDED COMPLAINT
(Title Ordered by the Court)
No Other Documents Attached

Judge's Order and motion sua sponte
February 22, 2021 (Dkt 18, 19, 20)

Judge: Hon. Larry Alan Burns
Dept: CTRM 14 A
Time: Unassigned
Date: Unassigned

1 written up for "lack of candor" nor proposed ten (10) day suspension as the Plaintiff
2 was given such a proposal., discriminating.
3

4 90. On January 30, 2015 Deputy Assistant Chief Patrol Agent Rodney Scott
5 presented the Plaintiff with a suspension letter based on the following, "... I
6 considered your explanation that this was unintentional. I also considered your
7 employment with the Federal government (not including 8 years military service,)
8 since August of 28, 1986. I also considered your five days suspension effective in
9 2010 for unprofessional conduct . . ." The EEOC complaint filed on April 22, 2010,
10 finalized August 20, 2013 for reprisal of prior protected activity was once again at
11 least four (4) times, again discriminating based on reprisal for prior protected EEO
12 activity. *Third time Agency used Plaintiffs five (5) day suspension unlawfully.*
13

14 91. Immediately following this January 30, 2015, proposal was to come a
15 termination, proposal, as stated by Plaintiff past Department Head that he was
16 informed of such an action. This constituted a proposal of disciplinary action and a
17 termination proposal.
18

19 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**
20

21 26 .For the forgoing reasons Plaintiff request that the Court grant leave to
22 amend his Original Complaint with this "Amended Complaint," pleading, and
23 other relief sought.
24

25 - 23 -

26 AMENDED COMPLAINT

27 20-cv-01981-LAB (BGS)

1 Where for the Plaintiff prays the court to grant the request for leave to amend his
2 complaint herein made for the foregoing reasons, as justice, fairness, equity, law
3 requires., Rule 1.
4

5 Additionally, the amount in controversy in the above referenced case, as
6 evidenced, is in excess of \$75,000. The Plaintiff made charges, testified, assisted, or
7 participated in EEOC enforcement proceedings and was retaliated against by the
8 Agency for doing so, again violating Title VII., Plaintiff praying \$300,000 for each
9 intentional unlawful discrimination, retaliation, each four(4) times the law violated.
10
11

12 Damages Prayed for: Under the Civil Rights Act of 1991, 42 U.S.C. § 1981a,
13 compensatory and punitive damages are available for a range of violations under Title
14 VII, including retaliation, the same under Constructive Discharge back pay, and
15 Disparate Treatment. *Harlow v. Fitzgerald*, 457 U.S. 800, 818, 102 S.Ct. 2727, 73
16 L.Ed.2d 396 (1982)). Bivens actions motioned for damages. *Marbury v. Madison*, 1
17 Cranch 137, 2 L.Ed. 60 (1803),
18
19

20 Finding that has not met its proof burden, the court is asked awarded the
21 Plaintiff in the least, compatible to 'Nassar' damages, \$438,167.66 in back pay and
22 \$3,187,500 in compensatory damages. Id *Nassar* 367.
23
24

Date: March 15, 2021

Respectfully Submitted,

26
27 By: 
28
Harold L. Wilborn

No. _____

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

HAROLD L. WILBORN Pro Se

Petitioner

v.

ALEJANDRO N. MAYORKAS
United States Secretary
of Homeland Security

Respondent

PROOF OF SERVICE

I Harold L. Wilborn, do declare under 28 U.S.C. § 1746, that on this date, November 18, 2022 as required by Supreme court Rule 29 I have served and enclosed Rule 40.1 the substantive documents filed by myself as a (service connected disabled) veteran and PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI on each party's counsel, and 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:

U.S. Court of Appeals
Ninth Circuit
James R. Browning
Courthouse
95 7th Street
San Francisco CA 94103

Solicitor General U.S.
Rm 5616, Dept. of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Clerk Office Supreme Court
of the United States
1 First Street, NE
Washington, DC 205443

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.
Executed on November 18, 2022

Harold L. Wilson

(Signature)

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

No. — — —

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

HAROLD L. WILBORN Pro Se

Petitioner

v.

ALEJANDRO N. MAYORKAS
United States
Secretary of Homeland
Security

Respondent

As required by the Supreme Court Rule 33.1(h), I certify
that the petition for a writ of certiorari contains 3,089 words,
excluding the parts of the petition that are exempted by Supreme
Court Rule 33.1(d).

I declare under penalty of perjury, 28 U.S.C. 1746 that the foregoing
is true and correct.

Executed on November 18, 2022,

Harold L. Wilborn

Harold L. Wilborn