

22-6272

No. 22-2468

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

SEP 29 2022

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Courtney Green — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

Kansas city public library ^{Trail West} Branch 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)

ORIGINAL
(Phone Number)

RECEIVED

OCT 25 2022

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

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 - ^{USCA} ~~Waldo~~ Branch 22-2469
- Courtney Green V. Mid continent Public library - North Independence
- Courtney Green V. ^{Schweitzer} ~~Switzer~~ Brentwood Branch library ^{USCA} 22-1906
- Courtney Green V. Midwest Genealogy Center ^{USCA} 22-1915

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☐ is unpublished.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☐ is unpublished.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☐ is unpublished.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☐ is unpublished.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 28, 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: September 7, 2022, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix A.

☐ 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).

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 Kansas city public library trails west branch for invasion of privacy

and the illegal transmission of personal information through cyber stalking and in person interaction. During the timeframe of 08/19/20-02/11/2021 Employees of the Respondent Kansas city public Library Trails west branch 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 Kansas city Public library trails west branch openly participated in the act of cyber stalking.

Back between the months of August 2020 until the beginning of February 2021 visited the Trails west branch 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 and Independence, 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; KCPL trails west branch being amongst one of those. I explained that this had been an ongoing matter and that my personal information was being secretly 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 August I began noticing that my online activity was being monitored by Employees of the branch. I noticed These actions were being carried out by an employee of the branch choosing a specific computer for me to use upon entering the branch and somehow screen mirroring and/or using other methods to virtual monitor my

online activity.

In one instance around mid-October or early November of 2020 an Employee of the branch was caught and openly admitted to monitoring my activity when a Visitor of the branch directly asked if the librarians could screen mirror the computer to help with an issue, One employee (an older female with a ponytail) felt she was caught and stated aloud and I quote “ Head office already knows about us doing this, all there going to do is tell us not to monitor peoples screens” laughing it off while showing signs of nervousness and anger. Employees of the Kansas City Public Library Trails west branch 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, activities that I was doing while utilizing branch computer services, DOB info as well as implementing password or other sensitive information into conversation. These actions also included coming up with various ways to obtain password and account information such as disabling certain capabilities on the 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 other information; While slowly gathering this information I began noticing that security breaches and past financial history from years back popping up through mail, phishing attempts through email etc. Which I also submitted a claim/complaint to a federal mail organization about while visiting this branch. On several occasions while attempting to log into Air BNB to reserve/book staying arrangements I would have issues with logging in often times having to go through the forgot my password process directly after just changing my password in the same sitting or be temporarily disabled from typing log in info at all, Also while logging in on

multiple occasions I would have to do an email verification or phone call to gain access to my account. After Employees of the branch noticed and acknowledged this, Often times I would either not receive the verification email or would still have issues with the verification email link so I would be forced to use the phone call verification option, Employees of the Kansas City Public Library Trails west branch observed that I would plug in my ear phones to hear the verification code which at the time I was using a 3rd party phone service provider and alerted branch visitors as well as other staff to obtain phone number and or service provider. I start noticing that on certain computers the audio option would be disabled and on specific days when branch employees as well as visitors of the branch would purposely time my visits to force me to sit at those computers. This behavior also occurred at other Missouri library branches as well.

Upon figuring out ways to do so, the 3rd party phone service line was somehow miraculously disabled, blocked and eventually disconnected and erased without my doing/consent. I reached out to the service provider about this issue on several occasions and was told that I had been disconnected from the server. While attempting to book/reserve Airbnb stays I would find that the booking options would disappear, I would reserve or book a stay and it would be canceled or I would not be able to reserve right away in efforts to manipulate missing out on the booking, prices would fluctuate right as I would be attempting to book. Employees of the Kansas City Public Library Trails west branch would study and gage my staying period and alert others and the next time I attempted to book upon logging in the stay options would already be set up to where a specific booking would not be visible, the price of booking would be an exact amount in my debit account for one night when usually that same price was for multiple nights or the price would be doubled to inconvenience or force me to spend more. I began booking 2 stays in advance in attempts to stay ahead and make sure I had a place for the night. After

Employees of the Kansas City Public Library Trails west branch noticed this, I began having issues with pay options and charge offs, one in which my PayPal account was charged off due to a negative balance when I had sufficient funds on hand in both my PayPal account (which was eventually charged off and forced closed “ref. Green v. Paypal inc. 8:22cv88”) as well as my debit account. I also submitted a civil case regarding this matter with the state of Nebraska (case 8:22cv88, plaintiff Courtney Green v. Defendant Paypal Inc.). In some cases employees of the Kansas City Public Library Trails west branch would openly joke about these actions amongst each other as well as while conversing with visitors of the branch. I experienced these same issues with phone service as well as with online ads and postings when attempting to apartment search for stable living arrangements as well as job hunt which further alerted me that my online activity was being monitored. This was also mentioned and implemented in local news coverage channels such as fox4, ky3, Ozarks fox referring to sites that I was using to search for stable living for example craigslist apartment listing and room shares as well as job opportunities I was pursuing. The mention of my living arrangements/me being homeless was also mentioned in cases with district court of New York in cases Green v. FOX Corporation Case Number:1:22-cv-00243-LTS/usca 22-898, Green v. NBC Universal Media LLC Case Number:1:22-cv-00239-LTS/usca 22-722. This behavior also occurred at other Missouri library branches as well. 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. This information was openly shared with visitors of the Kansas City Public Library Trails west branch through in person conversation. While communicating with business associates via online about goods and services during the month of October of 2021- December of 2021 I was

finishing a design for a business endeavor I was pursuing and the same Employee stated aloud and I quote "That's as far as you get". After this, during this timeframe I began noticing delays in communications with business associates. Also during this time frame while visiting the Kansas City Public Library Trails west branch I logged in to financial accounts for business purposes, while doing so I begin noticing that employees of the branch were implementing account balances, passwords, financial institutions, and other sensitive information and online activity into conversations amongst colleagues as well as branch visitors referring to me at times as well as nudging in my direction etc. Employees of this branch also began transferring to other branches such as the Kansas City public Library Waldo branch which was on the other side of town and that I just so happen to begin visiting May of 2020 to relay messages and aid in continuing the same behavior. The transferring of employees to different branches was also heard mentioned referring to employees who also participated in similar behavior at the Schweitzer Brentwood branch Library in Springfield, MO when Employees of the branch were alerted of legal actions being taken against them, which was also mentioned in case Green v. Schweitzer Brentwood Branch Library Case Number 6:22-cv-03008-FJG/USA 22-1905. Consecutively beginning in August 2020 until February of 2021 and August 2021 until September 2021 employees Kansas City Public Library Trails west branch openly and knowingly allowed and participated in the monitoring, internet stalking, invasion of privacy and the act of illegally gathering and sharing personal information without consent or cause and not once informed 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 22-2468 Green v. Kansas City Public Library Trails west branch 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 22-2468. 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 both defective documents as well as ones not recieved 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 22-1915,22-6469,22-1905 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 22-2468 is a vital portion and very much relevant to adjoining appeals (For reference 22-1915,22-6469,22-1905, NY usca 22-722,22-898 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 District Pro se court or the St. Louis, mo United states court of Appeals. Appeal 22-2468 Green v. Kansas city Public library Trails west

branch 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 22-2468 Green v. Kansas city Public Library Trails west branch.

Respectfully Submitted,

Courtney Green

Petitioner

P.o. Box 22444

Kansas City, Mo 64113