

22-6271

No. 22-1915

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

SEP 28 2022

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Courtney Green

(Your Name)

— PETITIONER

vs.

Midwest Genealogy Center

— RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

Eighth circuit Court of Appeals / Thomas F. Eagleton US Courthouse

(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Courtney Green

(Your Name)

Po Box 22444

(Address)

Kansas city, mo 64113

(City, State, Zip Code)

RECEIVED

NOV - 1 2022

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

(Phone Number)

ORIGINAL

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 _____; 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☐ is unpublished.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 A 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☐ is unpublished.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☐ is unpublished.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☐ is unpublished.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 July 7, 2022.

☐ 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: August 17, 2022, 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).

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:

RELATED CASES

- Courtney Green v. Kansas city public library - Wakko Branch USCA 22-2469
- Courtney Green v. Kansas city public library - Trails west Branch USCA 22-2468
- Courtney Green v. Mid continent public library - North Independence
- Courtney Green v. ^{Schweitzer} ~~Switzer~~ Brentwood Branch library USCA 22-1906

Question Presented

Whether these actions repeated in sequence over a course of time support claims of improper use of company software to carry out direct violations of the Petitioners personal privacy while using these methods to exploit personal information on more than one occasion in similar instances.

Petition For Writ of Certiorari

Petitioner Courtney Green respectfully requests the issuance of a writ of certiorari to review the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

Decision Below

The decision of the United States Court of appeals is published at the Eighth Circuit 2022.

Jurisdiction

The Eighth Circuit entered judgment 07/02/2022. The Petitioner submitted a petition for rehearing 09/07/2022 and was denied. The United States court of appeals ruled lack of jurisdiction due to untimely appeal.

Federal Rule Involved

Invasion of Privacy through the disclosure of private facts and intrusion of solitude, Illegal gathering and disbursement of private information, unfair business practices electronic communications privacy act, the stored communications act, the cybersecurity information sharing act, hacking.

Statement of Case

I the Petitioner Courtney Green am appealing a pro se lawsuit claim against the Respondent Midwest Genealogy Center for invasion of privacy and the illegal transmission of personal information through cyber stalking and in person interaction. During the timeframe of 05/13/20-02/11/2021 Employees of the Respondent Midwest Genealogy Center Library openly participated in the act of monitoring and stalking of online activity continually without consent. Exposed sensitive and private information including but not limited to financial standings, business endeavors creating unfair business practices, social media interactions, accounts/records as well as leaked legal proceedings information through various ways including in person communication. Which in turn led to ongoing Controversy, unfair business practices and unwarranted exposure resulting in the defamation of my character.

I. Green's circumstantial evidence that Midwest Genealogy Center openly participated in the act of cyber stalking.

Back between the months of May 2020 until the beginning of January 2021 visited the Midwest Genealogy Center and used the computer weekly during these dates. During this time I suspected that my online activity was being monitored as the same type of behavior occurred previously at other Library branches in the Kansas city, MO area. During the month of August I wrote a complaint to a cyber security organization regarding the matter. In this complaint I listed all library branches that I had been to; Midwest Genealogy Center being amongst one of those. I explained that this had been an ongoing matter and that my personal information was being obtained and dispersed and in doing so I was having difficulties and issues with

accounts being closed, services disconnected and or delayed, security breaches etc. During the month of May I began noticing that my online activity was being monitored this included Employees of the branch walking by glancing at my screen as well as standing close by on looking at my online activity. Employees of the Midwest Genealogy Center openly participated in the transmission of personal information through in person communication amongst colleagues as well as visitors that came into the library stating aloud things like exact amounts of money in my bank account after seeing that I had logged into my bank account. These actions also included coming up with various ways to obtain password and account information such as disabling certain capabilities on computers to delay or slow progress or to force visibility of sensitive information such as tax information, social security number, debit /credit card payment numbers and information. In some cases employees of the Midwest Genealogy Center would openly joke about these actions amongst each other as well as while conversing with visitors of the center. In August of 2020 I began applying and submitting weekly claims for unemployment while doing so I saw my screen flickering as if my monitor was being screenshot or someone was actively clicking on and off to monitor my screen. Also around this time I was attempting to contact the IRS about 2019 tax returns that had not been received and Employees of the branch saw this and began coming up with ways to delay or keep me from doing so. Employees of the Midwest Genealogy Center also aided in creating delays and unfair business practices when seeing that I was attempting to communicate with suppliers and perform business transactions. I began seeing these occurrences implemented into news stories and direct/indirect talks on tv programs I frequently watched or stumbled upon further letting me know that my online activity was being stalked and monitored. In one instance During the month of October 2020 on

CBS morning Gayle King implemented this into a story with a virtual guest hinting around a business endeavors I was pursuing at the time involving a jewelry piece I was attempting to create via online with a business associate/supplier which led me to believe my online browsing was being monitored. This was mentioned in another suit filed with the southern district of New York (Green v. Viacom CBS Case Number:1:22-cv-00238-LTS) now currently in New York US Court of Appeals Green V. Viacom CBS 22-724. In another instance during the month of October of 2020, I was conversing with another business associate online when a female associate walked by and deliberately looked at my screen and walked off, after this between the time period of October 27,2020-11/17/2020 I began seeing delays in communication and interruptions in service. Between this time I reached out to tech support for these online services and alerted and inquired about this issue. Along with this issue I attempted to create an illustration that involved a squirrel acorn and a tree amongst other details that I saw hints of on social media that further led me to believe my online activity was being monitored and or stalked. This also was later mentioned/hinted at in The Tyler Perry movie "Homecoming" that was recently released in 2022. Around this time back in 2020 KCTV5 also implemented a youtube video of a squirrel going through a obstacle course. On another occasion I begin actually seeing designs that I had created or specific color schemes from design in stores such as in Walmart Supercenter 11601 E US Hwy 40, Kansas City, MO 64133 on 02/16/2021 I entered the store around 4:30pm and discovered that most of the men's section of the store was filled with a shirt design I had previously done and had worked on while using the Midwest Genealogy Center computer services. People at the store were laughing and on this day around this time a local news crew was on the scene reporting a story in the parking lot. Subpoenas were submitted to the courts for visual aid in said incidents for the stated time frames. Consecutively beginning in May 2020 until February of

2021 employees of Midwest Genealogy Center openly and knowingly allowed and participated in the act of invasion of privacy through monitoring/ internet stalking data, and the act of illegally gathering and sharing personal information with colleagues and library visitors without consent or cause. The rising issue is that while Midwest Genealogy Center employees were aware of this cyber threat, neglected to act and/or inform me that my information had been hacked, shared or obtained.

II. The United States Court of Appeals Eighth Circuit Ruled the Case be dismissed on the basis of lack of jurisdiction due to untimely appeal.

The courts ruled on July 7, 2022 that appeal 22-1915 Green v. Midwest Genealogy Center be dismissed due to lack of jurisdiction due to untimely appeal. The said occurrences outlined in the body of statement of facts took place from the timeframe of august of 2020 up until february of 2021. In this timeframe other actions were taken such as filing complaints with cyber security organizations as well as reaching out to tech companies regarding services being abused regarding this incident, which was also all stated in the body of appeal 22-1915. The initial pro se lawsuit was filed in December of 2021, which fell in the same year of said occurrences. The initial filing was Then dismissed on January 10, 2022, by Kansas city,MO pro se courts. The petitioner wrote into the courts regarding the dismissal of this case as well as 4 other similar filings regarding the same matter, and even expressed to court clerks that he had received zero correspondence from the courts regarding these cases even after sending in updated address information. Due to a lengthy drawn out legal process of sending in motions to reconsider/reinstate, re-submitting documents on numerous occasions and sending proof of submission (copies of receipts and dated emails) and receiving no up date or

response from the courts. The petitioner expressed his feeling that this was a way of staling due process among other methods of writing off this case as well as other filings in which said actions were similar. (For reference 22-2468,22-6469,22-1905 etc.) A clear and accurate account of negligent actions were outlined in the statement of facts along with supporting documents and subpoenas for visual proof. Each location openly participated in these actions and should equally be held liable/accountable. The courts strictly enforce the 14 day response timeframe for the response to the deposition and the petitioner Courtney Green showed without doubt that timely actions were taken during the time of said occurring incidents and thereafter. Appeal 22-1915 is a vital portion and very much relevant to adjoining appeals (For reference 22-2468,22-6469,22-1905, NY usca 22-724 etc.)

Reasons For Granting the Writ

The court should grant Writ of Certiorari to clarify an accurate portion of the chain of events that aided in acts that have sequentially taken place over the course of three years.

The court should grant review in this case to oversee lawful integrity, examine factual findings and measure these actions along the legal scale. Weighing whether these actions were intentional and meant to target and cause unforeseen hardship and/or Malice to the petitioner. Taking into consideration the fiscal evidence stated outlining the strainius circumstances repeatedly endured over the course of time, not only degrade and undermine the value of one's person but display these methods were in many ways used in attempts to conform the petitioners way of thinking and living. Repeated occurrences of

similar incidents abandon the thought of coincidence and raise the suspicion of orchestrated plots. Showing consistency with daily visits further prove that These events could only be carried out by careful planning and some form of studying one's habits. Information being exploited could only be obtained through the breach of cyber data or the physical viewing thereof. It is shown, The petitioner Courtney Green showed without doubt that timely actions were taken during the time of said occurring incidents and thereafter; including but not limited to reaching out to cybersecurity organizations and other government resources regarding said issues, contacting company resolution centers regarding breaches and ongoing issues as well as pursuing legal proceedings. Due to the case being dismissed on the basis of untimely filings, lack of jurisdiction as well as other miscommunications it is strongly implied that this factual information was overlooked or never reached the point of review by Kansas city, mo Pro se court or the St. Louis, mo United states court of Appeals. Appeal 22-1915 Green v. Midwest Genealogy Center is one of five similar filings that are connected and aid in supporting other NY usca filings which make it a vital portion and very much relevant.

Conclusion

The petitioner Courtney Green respectfully asks that the court issue a Writ of Certiorari in United States Court of Appeals case 22-1915 Green v. Midwest Genealogy Center.

Respectfully Submitted,

Courtney Green

Petitioner

P.O. Box 22444 Kansas City, Mo 64113