

22-6988

ORIGINAL

NO. \_\_\_\_\_

FILED  
MAR 06 2023

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

**CARINA CONERLY; M.T. — PETITIONERS**

**v.**

**JOHN PATRICK WINN; SACRAMENTO COURT; JULIE G. YAP; SHARIF  
ROLAND TARPIN; KIANA TURNER; DAVID COLEMAN; SCOTT P.**

**HARMIN,— RESPONDENTS**

**ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

---

**TO UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT OF CALIFORNIA**

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORI**

---

---

**CARINA CONERLY**

**1501 AMAZON AVENUE**

**SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95835-1929**

**(916) 704-6755**

## **QUESTION(S) PRESENTED**

- 1. WHETHER,** The Ninth Circuit abused its discretion in holding and delaying Petitioners' cases?
- 2. WHETHER,** The Eastern District Court abused its discretion in holding and delaying Petitioners' cases?
- 3. WHETHER,** The District Judge was Negligence when he referred to Plaintiff/Petitioner as a "Prisoner"?
- 4. WHETHER,** The lower 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court abused its discretion by agreeing with the Eastern District Court, that Plaintiffs'/Appellants'/Petitioners' Case is "Frivolous"?
- 5. WHETHER,** Family Superior Court Judge Winn violated Petitioner's Constitutional Due Process Rights, under the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment to the United States Constitution, by issuing an order that deprived Petitioner of her Civil Rights to Video Tape in Public Parking Lot Equal Protection under the Equal Protection Clause and Right and Freedom to Process her Claim in The California Superior Court and The California Appellate Court?
- 6. WHETHER,** Petitioner's (Carina Conerly's,) Family Superior Court Judge Winn violated Petitioner's Constitutional Rights, under the 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment of The United

States Constitution by ordering Petitioner to give her right to remain silent and ordered Petitioner to have specific conversations Defendant Sharif Roldan Tarpin, and failure of her to do so could result into criminal charges brought against her?

**7. WHETHER, Family Superior Court Judge Winn violated Black-Petitioner's Constitutional and Civil Rights to Equal and Just Treatment under the 1964 Civil Rights act by helping and favoring Filipino-Respondent in processing and supporting his claims and defenses to complaints herein?**

**8. WHETHER, Family Superior Court Judge Winn violated Petitioners' Constitutional Rights, under the 1<sup>st</sup> Amendment of The United States Constitution by ordering Petitioner to not videotape in the public parking lot of Star Bucks and then public library?**

### **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**

**All Cases Listed below are involved in the Government Conspiracy**

**A. VERACITY- D.C. CASE NO. 2:19-CV- 01021 KJM KJN [D.C. Court had Plaintiffs to combine this case with the immediately following case [#2:19-CV CV-01113].**

**B. VERACITY - D.C. CASE NO . 2:19-CV-01113 TLN EFB, and the two cases became Case number 2:19-CV-01021 KJN**

**C. STATE OF CALIFORNIA - D.C.- CASE NO. 2:CV- 02535 [This Case involving U.S. Constitutional Violations, by Government Conspiracy,**

**against Plaintiffs' Civil Rights [including Guaranteed to Plaintiffs/**

**Appellants/Petitioners Rights To Constitutional Due Process**

is the **Foundation/Originating Case**, which was and is the starting point and the

**Conspiracy** connection for all the other cases of the “Federal Government Courts

**Forum”] for Plaintiffs/Appellants’/ Petitioners’ “Adjudication.” Defendants/Appellees /**

**Respondents agreed and acted to aid the State, its officials, others of its contact, and**

**each other, where knowingly attached to and joined into this Case herein and aided the**

**Others [Co-Conspirators] of This Defendant List to wrongfully stop Plaintiffs/**

**Appellants/ Petitioners from filing THIS CASE AT HAND and therefore, joined in with The**

**State Of California’s [included violation of Petitioner Carina Conerly “Wrongful**

**Employment Termination” where her right to **Due Process** involving her Right to the**

**Government’s Statutory Time allowed to defend and be heard against employment**

**termination from actually taking affect] and as a consequence, **Violate Petitioners’****

**Guaranteed Constitutional Rights To “Due Process”, which Comes**

**Under The Constitution’s 14<sup>th</sup> (Fourteenth) Amendment by**

**Government Officers, Agencies, Recruits, etcetera by Conspiring**

**together, and it has actually happened by way of the following**

**Defendants stated within the related and following Listed Cases:**

**D. OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MGT - D.C. CASE NO. 2:20-CV-00950 TLN-KJN,**

**E. OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MGT. CASE 9<sup>TH</sup> CIRCUIT No. 20-17502,**

**F. DAVENPORT, OFFICIAL PEST - D.C. CASE NO. 2:21 - CV- 01600**

**G. WINN YAP, YANG CASE D.C. NO. 2:21-CV-01076, 9<sup>th</sup> Circ. No. 22-15221**

**H. YANG CASE D.C. NO. 2-21-CV-01618 9<sup>th</sup> Cir. No. 2-15281**

**I. YAP CASE D.C. NO. 2:21-CV- 1132, 9<sup>TH</sup> CIR. No. 21-17041**

**J. REGENCY PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL – D.C. CASE NO. 2:22-cv-01525**

**1<sup>st</sup>. FILED: JUNE 4, 2019 BY **PLAINTIFFS CARINA CONERLY, AND****

**M.T.(CC AND MT)**

**DECISION/ORDER DATE: COMBINED WITH NEXT CASE #01113**

**VERACITY- D.C. CASE NO. 2:19-CV- 01021 KJM KJN ORDER**

**NINTH CIRCUIT CASE NO. 2017029**

**2<sup>nd</sup>. FILED: JUNE 18, 2019 BY **PLAINTIFFS JC AND MC.****

**DECISION/ORDER DATE: October 5, 2020.**

**VERACITY - D.C. CASE NO . 2:19-CV-01113 TLN EFB**

**NINTH CIRCUIT CASE NO. 2017029**

**3<sup>rd</sup>. FILED: DECEMBER 17, 2019 BY JC MC CC MT.**

**DECISION/ORDER DATE: September 3, 2021**

**STATE OF CALIFORNIA - D.C.- CASE NO. 2:CV- 02535**

**NINTH CIRCUIT CASE NO. 21-16603**

**4<sup>th</sup>. FILED: FEBRUARY 18, 2020 BY PLAINTIFFS JC MC CC MT**

**DECISION/ORDER DATE: July 20, 2020**

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CA D.C. CASE NO. 2:20-CV-00362**

**JAM-DB,**

**NINTH CIRCUIT CASE NO. \_\_\_\_\_**

**5<sup>th</sup>. FILED: MAY 8, 2020 BY PLAINTIFF MC**

**DECISION/ORDER DATE: February 17, 2020**

**OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MGT. D.C. 2:20-CV-00950 TLN-KJN**

**NINTH CIRCUIT CASE NO. 20-17502**

**6<sup>th</sup>. FILED: SEPTEMBER 11, 2020. FILED BY PLAINTIFFS JC MC CC MT**

**DECISION/ORDER DATE: October 15, 2020.**

**WINN, KIANA CASE D.C. NO. 2:20-CV-1833 JAM-AC.**

**NINTH CIRCUIT CASE NO. 20-17118**

**7<sup>th</sup>. FILED: JUNE 16, 2021, FILED BY PLAINTIFF CC**

DECISION/ORDER DATE: **February 1, 2022**

**WINN, YAP, YANG, ET. AL.-D.C. CASE NO. 2:21-CV-01076**

**NINTH CIRCUIT CASE NO. 22-15221**

**8<sup>th</sup>. FILED: JUNE 25, 2021, FILED BY CC AND MT**

DECISION/ORDER DATE: **November 29, 2021**

**YAP, ET. AL.-D.C. CASE NO. 2:21-CV-1132 TLN-CKD**

**NINTH CIRCUIT CASE NO. 21-17041**

**9<sup>th</sup> FILED: SEPTEMBER 7, 2021, FILED BY PLAINTIFFS JC AND MC**

DECISION/ORDER DATE: **February 9, 2021**

**DAVENPORT, OFFICIAL PEST- D.C. CASE NO. 2:21 -CV- 01600**

**NINTH CIRCUIT CASE NO. 21-17081**

**10<sup>th</sup>. FILED: SEPTEMBER 10, 2021, SEPTEMBER11,2021 FILED BY**

**PLAINTIFF CC**

DECISION/ORDER DATE: **May 25, 2022**

**YANG, ET. AL-D.C. CASE NO. 2-21-CV-01618 WBS-DB**

**NINTH CIRCUIT CASE NO. 2-15281**

**11<sup>th</sup> FILED: AUGUST 30, 2022, FILED BY PLAINTIFFS, JC, MT-C, CC AND**

**MINOR M.T.DECISION/ORDERS DATE**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....	11-12
JURISDICTION.....	12
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED .....	37
STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....	13-27
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT .....	32
CONCLUSION.....	32

## INDEX TO APPENDICES

### **APPENDIX A 1. MANDATE**

2 Decision/**ORDER** of the Ninth Circuit District Court of California to  
Dismiss as Being Frivolous

3 Referral by the Ninth

### **APPENDIX B Decision** of the California Eastern District Court Dismissing Complaint with Prejudice and Closing the Case

**APPENDIX C** Judge Winn “**Ordered**” Petitioners to not video-tape at the exchange.

**APPENDIX D** Respondent Sharif Tarpin Allowed to **video tape** at the exchange

**APPENDIX F Judge Scott Harman** Un-Constitutional Racially Bias Custody  
hearing/which included Judge Harman’s **Falsified and Forged documents** concerning

**Petitioner Carina's Income and Expense information; he did to Take away from**

**Respondent Sharif Tarpin's Child Support Payment Obligations**

**APPENDIX G Judge Harman's** hearing **Transcripts** (portraying the un-just and racial hatred toward Petitioner Carina Conerly

**APPENDIX H Judge Scott P. Harman's** documented evidence that Petitioners present as Petitioners' **evidence and support** to Petitioners' claims

**APPENDIX I Judge Scott P. Harman's** documented evidence that Petitioners present as Petitioners' **evidence and support** to Petitioners' claims

**APPENDIX J Judge Scott P. Harman's** documented evidence that Petitioners present as Petitioners' **evidence and support** to Petitioners' claims

**APPENDIX K Judge Julie G. Yap** Violated Petitioner Carina Conerly's Constitutional Rights under the First Amendment by, in part, issuing a Court Order that takes away Petitioners' First Amendment Rights and More.

**APPENDIX L David Coleman** documented evidence that Petitioners present as Petitioners' **evidence and support** to Petitioners' claims against Respondents

**APPENDIX M David Coleman, Court's** documented evidence that Petitioners present as support to Petitioners' Claims against David Coleman and his son Johnny Coleman's his role and acts that harmed Petitioner

**APPENDIX N This proof, when combined** with the entire files will but well serve in making better sense of not only David Colemans legal help to Defendant Sharif Tarpin,

**APPENDIX O Reference** documented evidence that Petitioners

present as Petitioners' **evidence and support** to Petitioners' claims against Defendant

**APPENDIX P Court file** documented evidence that Petitioners

present as Petitioners' **evidence and support** to Petitioners claims documented evidence that Petitioners have filed in Court. against Defendants.

**APPENDIX Q Johnny Coleman**, Friend of The Court, legal helper of Defendant

Sharif Roldan Tarpin, Persuader Respondent to initiate the Family Law Case for State to channel outside of Family Law complaint inside the Created Case that will serve to transfer **non-family Matters. Next, the state court can take exclusive and sovereign Control of the switched Family law case.**

## **TABLE OF CITED**

<b>CASES</b>	<b>PAGE No.</b>
Knicks vs. Township of Scott, Pa.139 S. Ct. 2162 (2019) .....	11, 18

## **STATUES AND RULES**

<b>1. Due Process .....</b>	<b>12, 14,18</b>
<b>2. Freedom of Speech .....</b>	<b>1 5, 17, 19,</b>
<b>3. 1<sup>st</sup> Amendment .....</b>	<b>14,15, 17, 19</b>
<b>4. 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>5. Appellants Rights, beyond the Constitution .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>6. Title 18 Section 241.....</b>	<b>12,14,18</b>
<b>7. U.S. Code Section 919b .....</b>	<b>32+</b>
<b>8. Government Conspiracy.....</b>	<b>13,14,19</b>
<b>Constitution</b>	
<b>9. Civil Rights Act of 1964 .....</b>	<b>14,18</b>
<b>10. Government Conspiracy.....</b>	<b>14,13,19</b>
<b>11. Right To Remain Silent .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>12. 2 U.S.C. 1983 .....</b>	<b>32</b>

**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 B 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 **December 6, 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: \_\_\_\_\_, 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. \_\_\_\_\_.

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

**Precedent: Case: Knicks vs. Township of Scott, Pa.139 S. Ct. 2162 (2019)**

**This Supreme Court Ruling Overrides The Administrative Procedure, And Now That State and Co-Conspirators Have Taken Petitioners Home When We Were Already To Close Our Mortgage, The State Begin The Placement Of A Bogus Lien On Petitioners Carina**

**Conerly's and M.T.'s Home, And, as of today, Two Liens On James Conerly's and Marilyn Tillman-Conerly's Home. They Also Damaged and Destroyed Petitioners Property Attachments of Petitioners Homes That Petitioners' Were Living In (to include the Attached Security Home Properties].**

Under **United States Civil Codes, 42 U.S.C. Section 2000e**, a case under the United States Constitution or federal laws or treaties is a federal question case. In this Case at hand, **Civil Rights Act of 1964, the First Amendment to the United States of America Constitution, the Fifth Amendment to the United States of America Constitution, the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States of America Constitution, Title 18 Section 241, and etcetera.**

## **STATEMENT OF CASE**

**Frivolous cannot withstand the UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION OF AMERICA'S QUESTIONS CONCERNING THESE VIOLATIONS OF ALL PLAINTIFFS' RIGHTS THAT ARE GUARANTEED HEREIN THIS FORUM THAT MANY HAVE BEEN REQUIRED TO APPEAR WITHIN AND UPHOLD THESE PROTECTED RIGHTS. Plaintiffs' Suit is Rightly and Justly Here Within the Federal Court; moreover, these violations cannot be JUSTLY RESOLVED IN CALIFORNIA'S FAMILY LAW COURTS, especially by those who appear to be unaware of the difference between a Family Law Issue vs. Federal Constitution Civil Rights**

**Questions [e.g. 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment and 1<sup>st</sup> Amendment Rights, and etcetera]. Pro Se Petitioners ask, are we right?**

Petitioners have Standing within this court because of Defendants' intentional acts to halt Petitioners from Constitutional Rights of Procedural and Substantive Due Process, and to deprive Plaintiff of Constitutional Guaranteed Civil Rights regardless of the fact that Petitioners are natural born a Black Persons in the United States of America. Defendants' mis-used their Government Positions, employees, Agencies, and etcetera, to agree and join into acts to co-act with overreaching power to over-power Plaintiff with their belief that no one would dare believe that such bad conduct would ever be practiced by government individuals within their positions and agency. Defendants damaged and injured Plaintiff due to all Defendants acting and being responsible due to their agreement to intentionally cause harm, injuries, and damages to Plaintiff and Plaintiff's property (See Knick v. Township of Pennsylvania), and as a consequence, Defendants succeeded in all their intentions as stated herein and it is well within reasonableness for any reasonable person to see that Plaintiff is not only presently harmed and damaged but more to be forthcoming. Plaintiff's Suits Provide at the least "a Federal Question" of, whether Plaintiff's Constitutional Rights to Due Procedural Process, Right to Equal Treatment, to video in the Public are deprived and violated by Defendants?

**Conspiracy - Systemic Racism Against Black American- Retaliation-Terrorization**

**Superior Court Sacramento, California.** Was and is the State Of California employer of all Defendant Judges in this case; therefore, it is responsible for the agencies and systems coming under its authority.

**1. John Patrick Winn (agreed and acted with other defendants in this case to also un-lawfully force Mother Carina Conerly to unwillingly render custody to Sharif Roldan Tarpin and to avoid paying Child Support. His Un-Constitutional Orders were also for his protection). Defendants, participated in, recruited, and was responsible for others who violated Plaintiff when Defendants and or their recruits laid and wait for Plaintiff, stalked Plaintiff, chased Plaintiff's vehicles, followed Plaintiff into Plaintiff's church gatherings (and other places like restaurants, McDonalds fast food restaurants, grocery stores, clothing stores, and everywhere Plaintiff would go), also into and around the Court Houses. Defendants have also un-lawfully re-filed Plaintiff's documents containing unlawful and incorrect added and deleted information that contained Plaintiff's signature as if Plaintiff had filed it. Such acts have been and was done with the intent to fraudulent documents and evidence inflict emotional Distress among other injuries, harm and damages to Plaintiff. Defendants liable to Plaintiff for Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress, Invasion of Privacy, Property Damages, Endangerment, Harassment, Retaliation.**

Plaintiff brings the issue of being deprived Constitutional protection from Government Judicial Officers' violating her Civil Rights protected by Title 18 Section 241, the Issue of Plaintiff being Black and for that fact, Plaintiff has experienced issues of deprivation of **Due Process provided under the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution Equal Treatment as other Race have enjoyed under the United States Constitution, Civil Rights Act of 1964** and all Defendants agreed forming a **conspiracy by agreeing and acting in evil anger to purposely retaliate because Plaintiff asserted her Constitutional Rights**

to seek justice in Federal Court. Defendants shows bad conduct acted in Ignorance of **THE JUDICIAL OATH TAKEN** to purposely deprive Plaintiff of her **Rights Guaranteed By The United States Constitution**; as result and consequence, Plaintiff continues to irreparably suffer from Defendants' unlawful acts being done to Plaintiff. Defendant Judge Winn recently and again, violated Plaintiff's United States Constitution under the First Amendment, for United the States Citizens of all Race within this court and broad, the **"Right to Freedom of Speech,"** with the **Right To Videotape in public** to be recognized as one of those rights to be protected and respected. In the case at hand, Defendant John Patrick Winn issued an order with the **intent to deprive Plaintiff of her Constitutional Right to Free Speech Under the United States Constitution to Videotape** in the public area of a parking lot near Starbucks and then the present drop-off location of the South Natomas Library. Defendant Judge Winn issued a second order on August 27, 2020, and more times thereafter, that targeted only at Black Plaintiff, Carina Conerly, herein this case at hand, and to deprive Plaintiff of her Rights to videotape Policemen, State Highway Patrolmen, Individual Citizens of the United States of America. Another **fact** is, in a hearing prior to this most current order, Judge Winn viewed evidence that Plaintiff, Carina Conerly, provided to Judge Winn and others within the Court. This evidence supported Carina Conerly's complaints of statements in the Court hearing. As a consequence, Defendant, Sharif Roldan Tarpin, was proven to be making allegations to Judge Winn and the rest of the Court. Unfortunately, Judge Winn failed to accept Plaintiff's evidence because it also exposes their unlawful action by his giving Plaintiff's evidence no weight for Plaintiff, Carina Conerly, and Ms. Conerly saw the continuing **biasness** in favor of Defendant, Sharif Roldan Tarpin.

**2. Defendant, Sharif Tarpin, his associates, and friends also videotaped at both the same locations as Plaintiff was at.** By reading Judge Winn's order, a reasonable person can readily and easily detect that Judge Winn was bias when taking Defendant's, Sharif Tarpin's, words and testimony as true, without any presentation or witness thereto.

**Actually, the Orders read as a whole to be seen as bias in favor of Non-Black Race, Defendant, Sharif Tarpin.** Not only are these incidents facts of racial discrimination and violation of Plaintiff's Civil Rights and Constitutional Rights, but also Violations of all Plaintiff's Rights to Due Process in the hearing presided over by Judge John Patrick Winn. Guaranteed Equal Rights under the United States **Can Not Be Deprived of Judges Issuing an Order To Stop Citizens From Exercising Their Rights To Equal Treatment, Due Process, and Civil Rights as a Whole.** Simply stated, no Judge is given the Authority, capacity, nor right to act as Congress, and in essence **issue an order that requires to change or amend the United States Constitution, nor deprive Citizens of Their Guaranteed United States Constitutional Right or Rights.** Here, Judge John Patrick Winn has overreached outside of his protected capacity and should be stopped by this court and held liable for the damages and injuries he has done to Plaintiff, Carina Conerly. **Please take judicial notice that Plaintiff's major issues and focus are directed to Plaintiff's RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS, RIGHT TO FREE SPEECH, CIVIL RIGHTS, CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS, RIGHTS TO EQUAL and JUST TREATMENT, AND RETALIATION.** It appears that when the court finish with Plaintiff, there will be no other legal work needed for Sharif Tarpin to do at this stage, because the court would have done it all for him to violate Plaintiff by him participating with Government Judicial Officers' Un-constitutional acts in

exchange for, at the least their support and help in illegal awards of illegal representation, illegal and unlawful orders granted in Sharif Tarpin's favor, and serve his and their illegal purposes . However, Plaintiff is getting an experience in “Systemic Racism” against Black Americans and realize how much we are not free, especially when some cover-up for Sharif Tarpin's and his assistant helper, Kiana Turner's, involvement and association with Drug use, Drug Sell, Drug movement through the United States' Federal Mail, and Gang activities. Defendants' exploitation of some of their recruits are Un-Constitutional, although, those recruited should be held liable for their intentional acts, their recruiters are not blameless for their acts, but to be held liable in all circumstances that are revealed herein this suit.

**3. . Scott P. Harman (falsified Plaintiff's income on 6/14/2021 and other things prior and after this date. Defendant agreed and acted with other Judicial Officers to violate and do wrongful harm to Plaintiff by means of the Family Law Systems and other State Systems “conspiracy” with no interest of Minor M.T. Defendant acted prior and after with other defendants in this case to also un-lawfully force Mother to unwillingly render custody to Sharif Roldan Tarpin and for him to avoid paying Child Support. Defendant Sharif Tarpin is a known Drug Dealer in Del Paso Heights area and other known locations; he sells drugs and Marijuana, uses drugs and Marijuana, uses the U.S. Federal Postal System to carry on his drug deals and distributions, has an affiliation, association and connection with Guns and Gangs; “Drugs, Gangs, and Guns.” These Judicial Officers are definitely supporting him. Defendant Sharif Roldan Tarpin Please review the Court Hearings Transcripts and**

evidence submitted by Plaintiff and her witnesses? I am sure that you will be surprised of the corrupted systems. Minor M.T. is in danger when in Defendants “Care and Custody”). The Defendant Judicial Officers, Defendant, Sharif Tarpin, and other Defendants are Co-Conspirators against Plaintiff’s Due Process Rights, Civil Rights, and Free Speech. Please note that this case has been frauded as a Private Paternity Case, in order to covertly “seal” the facts, it should be unsealed even for the higher Courts to see. These Defendants are responsible for Plaintiff being stalked and followed to places such as McDonald’s fast food restaurants, grocery stores, clothing stores, and are tied to other acts of stalking Plaintiff, chasing Plaintiff, lay and wait for Plaintiff everywhere Plaintiff would go), also into and around the Court Houses . Defendants have also un-lawfully re-filed Plaintiff’s documents containing unlawful and incorrect added and deleted information that contained Plaintiff’s signature as if Plaintiff had filed it. Such acts have been and were done with the intent to fraud documents and evidence to inflict emotional Distress among other injuries, harm and damages to Plaintiff. Defendants were responsible for Plaintiff’s Home and other property being damaged, and are also liable to Plaintiff for Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress, Invasion of Privacy, Property Damages (*Knicks v. Township of Pennsylvania*), Endangerment, Harassment, Retaliation, and etcetera.

Plaintiff brings the issue of being deprived **Constitutional** protection from Government Judicial Officers’ violating her Civil Rights protected by **Title 18 Section 241**, the Issue of Plaintiff being Black and for that fact, Plaintiff has experienced issues of deprivation of **Due Process provided under the Fourteenth Amendment of the United State Constitution, Equal Treatment as**

other Race have enjoyed under the United States Constitution , Civil Rights Act of 1964,an all Defendants agreed forming a conspiracy by agreeing and acting in evil anger to purposely retaliate because Plaintiff asserted her Constitutional Rights to seek justice in Federal Court. Defendants show bad conduct acted in Ignorance Of THE JUDICIAL OATH TAKEN to purposely deprive Plaintiff of her Rights Guaranteed By The United States Constitution; as result and consequence, Plaintiff continues to irreparably suffer these acts being done to Plaintiff by Defendants unlawful Acts. Defendants recently and again, violated Plaintiff's United States Constitutional First Amendment Rights because all United States Citizens of all Race within this court and broad, are guaranteed "Right to Freedom of Speech," with the Right To Videotape in public to be recognized as one those rights to be protected and respected. In the case at hand, Defendant John Patrick Winn issued an order with the intent to deprive Plaintiff of her Constitutional Right to Free Speech Under the United States Constitution to Videotape in the public area of a parking lot near Starbucks and then the present drop-off location of the South Natomas Library.

4. Julie G. Yap (agreed and acted on 5/28/2021 and prior with other defendants in this case to also, un-lawfully force Plaintiff, Carina Conerly, the mother of minor M.T. to

unwillingly render custody to Sharif Roldan Tarpin in order for him to avoid paying Child Support

and she gave Sharif Tarpin's Girlfriend un-lawful rights that are equivalent to 'Shared Custody" to assert over Minor M.T. This act of Ms. Yap has already harmed Minor M.T. and her mother, Plaintiff, Carina Conerly. Ms. Yap also enjoined with Mr. Winn in enforcing the previous orders that Mr. Winn had enforced that violated her Civil and Constitutional Rights. Therefore, Ms. Yap is legally responsible and liable to Plaintiff,

**Carina Conerly, and Minor M.T. for not only Ms. Yap additionally violated Un-constitutional orders; Moreover, her joining in “conspiring” with Mr. Winn and all others involved in this conspiracy, are to be linked with the higher foreseeable Conspiracy that is ongoing). Defendants agreed and acted with other Judicial Officers to violate and do wrongful harm to Plaintiff by means of the Family Law Systems and other State Systems “conspiracy” with no interest of Minor M.T. Defendant acted prior and after with other defendants in this case to also un-lawfully force Mother to unwillingly render custody to Sharif Roldan Tarpin and for him to avoid paying Child Support. Defendant Sharif Tarpin is a known Drug Dealer in Del Paso Heights area and other known locations; he sells drugs and Marijuana, uses drugs and Marijuana, uses the U.S. Federal Postal System to carry on his drug deals and distributions, has an affiliation, association and connection with Guns and Gangs; “Drugs, Gangs, and Guns.” These Judicial Officers are actually supporting him. Please review the Court Hearings Transcripts and evidence submitted by Plaintiff and her witnesses? I am sure that you will be surprised of the corrupted systems. Minor M.T. is in danger when in Defendants “Care and Custody”). The Defendant against Plaintiff’s Due Process Rights, Civil Rights, and Free Speech. Please note that this case has been frauded as a Private Paternity Case, in order to covertly “seal” the facts, it should be unsealed even for the higher Courts to see. These Defendants are responsible for Plaintiff being stalked and followed to places such as McDonald’s fast-food restaurants, grocery stores, clothing stores, and are tied to other acts of stalking Plaintiff, chasing Plaintiff, lay and wait for Plaintiff everywhere Plaintiff would go), also into and around the Court House. Defendants have also un-lawfully re-filed Plaintiff’s documents containing unlawful and incorrect added and deleted information that contained Plaintiff’s**

Plaintiff brings the issue of being deprived Constitutional protection from Government Judicial Officers' violating her Civil Rights protected by Title 18 Section 241, the Issue of Plaintiff being Black and for that fact, Plaintiff has experienced issues of deprivation of **Due Process provided under the Fourteenth Amendment of the United State Constitution , Equal Treatment as other Race have enjoyed under the United States Constitution , Civil Rights Act of 1964**, an all Defendants agreed forming a **conspiracy by agreeing and acting in evil anger to purposely retaliate because Plaintiff asserted her Constitutional Rights to seek justice in Federal Court. Defendants show bad conduct and acted in Ignorance Of THE JUDICIAL OATH TAKEN to purposely deprive Plaintiff of her Rights Guaranteed By The United States Constitution**; as result and consequence, Plaintiff continues to irreparably suffer these acts being done to Plaintiff by Defendants unlawful Acts.

Defendants, participated in, recruited, and was responsible for others who violated Plaintiff when Defendants and or their recruits **laid and wait for Plaintiff, stalked Plaintiff, chased Plaintiff vehicles, followed Plaintiff into Plaintiff's church gatherings (and other places like restaurants, McDonald's fast food restaurants, grocery stores, clothing stores, and everywhere Plaintiff would go), also into and around the Court Houses . Defendants have also un-lawfully re-filed Plaintiff's documents containing unlawful and incorrect added and deleted information that contained Plaintiff's signature as if Plaintiff had filed it.** Such acts have been and was done with the intent to fraudulent documents and evidence to inflict emotional Distress among other injuries, harm and damages to Plaintiff. Also, Defendants are liable for **Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress, Invasion of Privacy, Property Damages, Endangerment, Harassment, Retaliation.**

**5. Sharif Roldan Tarpin (agreed and acted “conspired” with other Defendants, Co-Conspirators), to include” 6/14/2021 and prior with other Defendants in this case to unlawfully force Plaintiff, mother, into unwillingly render custody to himself, Defendant, Sharif Roldan Tarpin, and for him to avoid paying Child Support. Performing wrongly and prior to Judges’ orders, even before the bias-order is signed and filed. This demonstrates the power that he stated that the Judges transferred to him over Plaintiff, Carina Conerly, and her minor daughter M.T.).**

**6/16/2021, Defendant Sharif Tarpin took the liberty of trying to enroll Minor M.T. into a daycare/pre-school without the voluntary consent of Plaintiff, Mother of Minor M.T. because he felt empowered by the Judges’ actions taken against Plaintiff, Carina Conerly. The Judges and other State Government Officials, enhanced Sharif Tarpin’s actions by the fact that these Judges have shielded him, been bias against Plaintiff, Carina Conerly, Sharif Tarpin having freedom of speech in the Court Hearings,**

**whereby the Judges cut Plaintiff, Carina Conerly, off when her evidence supported her allegations and Lawful Constitutional Rights and Family Laws governing the trial or other legal proceedings. Unfortunately, Defendant, Sharif Tarpin, was at liberty to speak as he was pleased to do without being cut-off from speaking, except for, when he was hurting his own case, then the Judges would Stop him, or pretend that they were having technical problems (such as computer problems that were manipulated by the court’s Judges or staff which also included the Court Reporters that Plaintiff, Carina Conerly, requested.**

Mr. Tarpin has been heard by Plaintiff, Carina Conerly, and witnessed saying to her that the Judges, Police and others are on his side and he is going to win. Plaintiff, Carina Conerly, and other witnesses have **evidence and proof to these truthful statements.**

**6. Kiana Turner (agreed and acted on 6/09/2021 and prior with other defendants in this case**

**to also un-lawfully force Mother, Carina Conerly, of Minor M.T. to unwillingly render custody to Sharif Roldan Tarpin for him to avoid paying Child Support).**

**This Defendant (also, un-lawfully shares custody with Sharif Tarpin of minor M.T. She does not qualify for custody) not by California FL Section 3088, nor 3100, nor any other Law, especially since Defendant Kiana Turner is the Father's, Sharif Tarpin's, girlfriend who has never had any established interest or relationship with minor M.T. and the Plaintiff, Mother, Carina Conerly, strongly objects to the Judge's order because minor M.T. already shows damages that are done to her and Plaintiff. Defendant, Kiana Turner, has provided and currently provides Defendant, Sharif Roldan Tarpin, her automobile to carry on his illegal Court Ordered functions, such as, pick-up and drop-off Minor M.T., because his automobile had the strong smell of Marijuana due to his repeatedly smoking Marijuana while driving and parked in his car. To cover-up and hide his car's detected odor of Marijuana, and the embarrassment of Defendant Judges and other Defendants, he has just recently gotten a rental car. Kiana Turner made herself liable by volunteering to agree and assist Defendants.**

**7. David Coleman (as recent as 12/22/2020, Defendant David Coleman was acting and in disagreement Co-Conspirator along with Defendants in illegally helping and advising Defendant Sharif Roldan Tarpin. Evidence shows that Mr. Coleman is responsible for Sharif**

Tarpin's idea of filing a Family Law Case against Carina for custody in order to avoid Sharif Tarpin from paying child support and to assist State in retaliation against Plaintiff, Carina Conerly, and interfering with Carina Conerly's legal lawsuit. Evidence shows Mr. Colemans connections with Sacramento's Family Law System). Mr. Coleman also has a history of involvement with state in favor for men wanting to obtain custody of their minor child. I have personal knowledge that Sharif Tarpin is not capable of doing the legal work that is involved in this case at hand, because I helped him to do his Dental Schooling. My evidence is proof to these facts. Defendant Sharif Tarpin agreed and acted with David Coleman [a friend of the Sacramento County Family Law Division of The Superior Court of Sacramento, California, and an Advocate for fathers gaining Custody of Minor Children] a defendant in this case. of California, whom also un-lawfully forced mother to unwillingly render custody to Sharif Roldan Tarpin and whom also aided State for him to avoid paying Child Support). David Coleman's Son, Johnny Coleman has assisted David Coleman in helping Sharif Tarpin.

**John Does** Co-conspirators. Discriminators. Retaliators.

**Jane Does** Co-conspirators. Discriminators. Retaliators.

Now comes Plaintiff, Carina Conerly, to strongly feel that Defendants' **Conduct** is not appreciative for being injuring to Plaintiff and Minor M.T., being responsible for terrorizing Plaintiff, being responsible for damaging Plaintiff's properties (to include home and making home hazardous to live in), being responsible for assault and battery upon Plaintiff, being hostile towards Plaintiff for exercising Constitutional **RIGHTS TO BE FREE FROM JUDICIAL GOVERNMENT CONSPIRACY, TO BE FREE OF JUDICIAL RETALIATION FOR SEEKING JUSTICE, RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS, RIGHT TO BE TREATED EQUAL**

**REGARDLESS OF BEING A “BLACK” AMERICAN** seeking redress and relief within the courts. Plaintiff will continue to act with **CONDUCT** respectfully, rightfully, and in a justly manner toward others involved herein and this Court as she asserts the **rights to be heard** and **allowed to present evidence** to support this lawsuit that she brings as a benefit of being a **Natural Born Citizen of the United States Of America**, and this I swear under the **“OATH”** I hereby take to be **“THE TRUTH, THE WHOLE TRUTH, AND NOTHING BUT THE TRUTH; SO, HELP ME GOD”**

## **CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED**

- 13. Due Process**
- 14. 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment of the U.S. Constitution**
- 15. Freedom of Speech**
- 16. 1<sup>st</sup> Amendment**
- 17. Appellants Rights, beyond the Constitution**
- 18. 9<sup>th</sup> Amendment**
- 19. Government Conspiracy Against Plaintiffs’/Appellants’ Civil Rights**
- 20. Title 18 Section 241**
- 21. Civil Rights**
- 22. 1964 Civil Rights Act**
- 23. Government Conspiracy**
- 24. Right To Remain Silent**
- 25. 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment**
- 26. Title 18 Section 241**
- 27. Systemic Racism, Systemic**

## **LIST OF PARTIES**

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

**NINTH CIRCUIT CASE NO. 20-17118**

**7<sup>th</sup>. FILED: JUNE 16, 2021, FILED BY PLAINTIFF CC**

**DECISION/ORDER DATE: February 1, 2022**

**WINN, YAP, YANG, ET. AL.-D.C. CASE NO. 2:21-CV-01076**

**NINTH CIRCUIT CASE NO. 22-15221**

**8<sup>th</sup>. FILED: JUNE 25, 2021, FILED BY CC AND MT**

**DECISION/ORDER DATE: November 29, 2021**

**YAP, ET. AL.-D.C. CASE NO. 2:21-CV-1132 TLN-CKD**

**NINTH CIRCUIT CASE NO. 21-17041**

**9<sup>th</sup> FILED: SEPTEMBER 7, 2021, FILED BY PLAINTIFFS JC AND MC**

**DECISION/ORDER DATE: February 9, 2021**

**DAVENPORT, OFFICIAL PEST- D.C. CASE NO. 2:21 -CV- 01600**

**NINTH CIRCUIT CASE NO. 21-17081**

**10<sup>th</sup>. FILED: SEPTEMBER 10, 2021, SEPTEMBER11,2021 FILED BY**

**PLAINTIFF CC**

**DECISION/ORDER DATE: May 25, 2022**

**YANG, ET. AL-D.C. CASE NO. 2-21-CV-01618 WBS-DB**

**NINTH CIRCUIT CASE NO.22-15281**

**11<sup>th</sup> FILED: AUGUST 30, 2022, FILED BY PLAINTIFFS, JC, MT-C, CC AND**

MINOR M.T. DECISION/ORDERS DATE

**REASON FOR GRANTING THE PETITION**

- 1. Sequential Filing Necessary Because of Conspiracy connections. It is virtually not possible to stay on-track of the adding of Co-Conspirators.**
- 2. The 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit California Appellate aided the Eastern District Court by not only misapplying code and case law to support the Eastern District of California Unconstitutional handling of Petitioners' Cases.**
- 3. The 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit California Appellate aided the Eastern District Court by ignoring Petitioners' request for the Lower Courts to address Petitioners' Request For Help concerning attacks upon Petitioner to interfere with Petitioner Litigating their case without Some Respondents violating Federal Civil and Criminal Laws in order to Terrorizing Petitioners, Threatening Petitioners, Assaulting Petitioners.**
- 4. Both lower Courts have intentionally derived Petitioners of a Just handling and Ruling in the Courts. Federal Courts, including the 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit California Appellate Court.**

**CONCLUSION**

**The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.**

**Respectfully submitted,**

**Signature** *Cain Casley* **Date:** **March 06, 2023**