

22-726

4/27/22

No.

IN THE

**Supreme Court of the United States**

Alejandro Evaristo Perez,

Pro Se Petitioner

v.

LinkedIn Corporation,

Responder

---

To The United States Court Of Appeals For The Ninth  
Circuit (#21-15234)

---

**PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

**PRO SE PETITIONER:**

ALEJANDRO EVARISTO PEREZ  
9233 WESTHEIMER, #405  
HOUSTON, TX 77063  
(214) 762-0075  
[alejandro.evaristo.perez@gmail.com](mailto:alejandro.evaristo.perez@gmail.com)

**RESPONDER:**

JASON SKAGGS, ATTORNEY  
530 LYTTON AVENUE  
2<sup>ND</sup> FLOOR  
PALO ALTO, CA 94301  
(650) 617-3226  
[jason.skaggsfaucette.com](mailto:jason.skaggsfaucette.com)

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED

The original questions were “Whether the excommunication of an Honorable US War Veteran (and paying customer) by Fallen Federal Judges and unpatriotic Corporatistas for the evil Chinese Communist Party is a California Anti-SLAPP violation or Federal Treason? And how many thousands of Americans have to die from a CCP bioweapon pandemic developed in the Wuhan P4 Virology Center before Fallen Federal Judges acknowledge it as a ‘Topic of Public Issue/Interest’? And did such suppression aid the CCP’s bioweapon pandemic further infesting and killings thousands of Americans?” Now, we have additional questions before the US Supreme Court, because the original questions were rejected in malice when Rule 40 (Veterans, Seamen, and Military Cases) was violated when rejecting multiple “Motion For Leave To Proceed As An Honorable Us Veteran”. Additional questions arise like “Do we need Martial Law to enforce Rule 40 and elected real Patriotic

Federal Judges via a bipartisan effort?"; "Why is the US Supreme Court hating on US War Veterans and hating on Rule 40?"; "Why have the Fallen Judges and Traitors not peacefully settle and simply accept the generous terms of surrender?" The additional questions can only be answered by US President Joseph Biden; and thus, the new questions are technically out of the scope of the US Supreme Court. Please note the US President Joseph Biden's White House has been informed of the Pro Se Party's requests for Martial Law. After raising the settlement/damages/pardon to \$256BN due to the multiple "Rule 40" insults, docket mismanagement, many failed negotiations, and US Code violations, the Pro Se Party (the Honorable US War Veteran, and Honorable US Army Officer) presents the original questions via this petition to the corrupted US Supreme Court. What will the violators of Rule 40 have to say about the original questions? Will they have a mighty revelation, change of hearts, and finally apologize for over 2 years?

## LIST OF PROCEEDINGS

US Court Of Appeals For The Ninth Circuit

21-15234

Alejandro Evaristo Perez, Pro Se Appellant. LinkedIn

Corporation, Appellee

Date of Final Opinion: November 18, 2021

\_\_\_\_\_ † \_\_\_\_\_

California Northern District (CAND) Federal Court

5:20-cv-07238-EJD

Alejandro Evaristo Perez, Pro Se Plaintiff v. LinkedIn

Corporation, Defendant

Date of Final Opinion: February 05, 2021

\_\_\_\_\_ † \_\_\_\_\_

Texas Southern District (TXSD) Federal Court

4:20-cv-02188

Alejandro Evaristo Perez, Pro Se Plaintiff v. LinkedIn

Corporation, Defendant

Date of Final Opinion: October 7, 2020

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

QUESTIONS PRESENTED.....	i
LIST OF PROCEEDINGS.....	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iv
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	vi
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI.....	1
OPINION BELOW.....	1
JURISDICTION AND INTERESTED PARTIES.....	1
STATUTES & CASES PROVISIONS INVOLVED.....	2
INTRODUCTION & OATH.....	10
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	14
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT.....	23
CONCLUSION.....	25
APPENDIX & ADMIN REQUIREMENTS.....	27

**TABLE OF CONTENTS – Continued****APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Opinion by the Fallen Judges who censored the US War Hero for the Chinese Communist Party, who used Obsolete Case Law, and used Sex-Related case law, (November 18, 2021) .....	1a
Opinion by the Fallen Judge Edward Davila who censored the US War Hero for the Chinese Communist Party, who used Obsolete Case Law, and violated the Actual Language of the Law, (February 05, 2021) .....	4a
The Denial Of Combined Petition For Panel Rehearing and Rehearing En Banc by the Fallen Judges who Censored the US War Hero for the Chinese Communist Party, who failed to entertained the Pro Se Plaintiff, and used Sex-Related caselaw, (March 03, 2022) .....	17a

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
<b>US CODES</b>	
5 U.S.C. § 3331.....	2, 10, 14, 15, 25, 29
18 U.S.C. § 2381.....	2, 3, 6, 10, 12 - 19, 22 - 25
28 U.S.C. § 1654.....	3, 29
California C.C.P. § 425.16(a).....	3 - 6, 12 - 23, 25
California C.C.P. § 425.16(c).....	3 - 6, 12 - 23, 25
<b>US FEDERAL CASES</b>	
<i>Calvary Chapel Dayton Valley v. Steve Sisolak, Et Al,</i>	
Supreme Court, No. 19A1070 (2020).....	4, 5, 10, 28
<i>Alejandro Evaristo Perez v. LinkedIn Corporation,</i>	
9th Circuit, No. 21-15234 (2021).....	iii, 5, 6
CAND, 5:20-cv-07238-EJD (2020).....	iii, 1, 5, 21, 27
TXSD, 4:20-cv-02188 (2020).....	iii, 2, 6, 27
<i>Schneider v. TRW, Inc.,</i>	
9th Circuit, 938 F. 2d 986, 992, (1991).....	5, 6, 12, 22

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued**

**US FEDERAL CASES**

*Haines v. Kerner,*

Supreme Court, No. 70-5025 (1972).....7, 28

*Resnick v. Hayes,*

9th Circuit, 213 F.3d 443, 447 (2000).....7, 28

*McKinney v. De Bord,*

9th Circuit, 507 F.2d 501, 504, (1974).....7, 28

*Farettta v. California,*

Supreme Court, No. 422 U.S. 806 (1975).....7, 8, 28

*USA v. Automated Medical Laboratories,*

4<sup>th</sup> Circuit, 770 F.2d 399 (1985).....8, 26

*USA v. Cincotta,*

1st Circuit, 689 F.2d 238, 241-42 (1982).....8, 26

*State Of Oklahoma v Shriver,*

US Supreme Court, No. 21-985 (2022).....8, 29

**JUDICIAL RULES**

Sup. Ct. R. 40.....5, 9, 16, 27, 28, 29

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

Alejandro Evaristo Perez, the Pro Se Petitioner, respectfully petitions for a writ of certiorari to review the unjust judgment of Fallen Federal Judges that happen to work in the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and the Federal District Court of the Northern District of California.

---

†

---

**OPINION BELOW**

The opinion of the Fallen Judges (App. 1a) in the Ninth Circuit is reported at 9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 21-15234 as mentioned in the Table of Authorities. The opinion of the district court (App. 4a) is reported at CAND 5:20-cv-07238-EJD.

---

†

---

**JURISDICTION & INTERESTED PARTIES**

The Ninth Circuit entered judgment on March 03, 2022, and denied a timely combined petition for panel rehearing and rehearing en banc on March 03, 2022 (App. 17a). This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. Section 1254(1) "Courts of appeals; Certiorari; Certified Questions".

Alejandro Evaristo Perez is the Pro Se Petitioner. IAW US Supreme Court Rule 29.6 “corporate disclosure statement”, on 14 August 2020 in TXSD 4:20-cv-02188 with a Certificate of Service, the Responder, LinkedIn Corporation, declared that it is a Delaware corporation that is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Microsoft Corporation, a publicly-held corporation. Microsoft has no parent company, and no publicly held corporation owns more than 10% of its stock.

---

†

---

#### **STATUTES & CASES PROVISIONS INVOLVED**

##### **5 U.S.C. § 3331**

##### **Military Officer Oath**

“support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic”

##### **18 U.S.C. § 2381**

##### **Treason**

“giving enemies aid and comfort within the United States or elsewhere, is guilty of treason and shall

suffer death, or shall be imprisoned not less than five years and fined under this title but not less than \$10,000; and shall be incapable of holding any office under the United States."

**28 U.S.C. § 1654**

**Appearance personally or by Counsel**

"In all courts of the United States, the parties may plead and conduct their own cases personally or by counsel as, by the rules of such courts, respectively, are permitted to manage and conduct cause therein."

**California C.C.P. § 425.16(a)**

**California's Anti-SLAPP Law (a)**

"... The Legislature finds and declares that it is in the public interest to encourage continued participation in matters of public significance, and that this participation should not be chilled through abuse of the judicial process. To this end, this section shall be

construed broadly.” [same legal text as the 2015 version]

**California C.C.P. § 425.16(e)(3)&(4)**

**California’s Anti-SLAPP Law (e)(3)&(4)**

“As used in this section, ‘act in furtherance of a person’s right of petition or free speech under the United States or California Constitution in connection with a public issue’ includes: ... (3) any written or oral statement or writing made in a place open to the public or a public forum in connection with an issue of public interest, or (4) any other conduct in furtherance of the exercise of the constitutional right of petition or the constitutional right of free speech in connection with a public issue or an issue of public interest.”

[same legal text as the 2015 version]

*Calvary Chapel Dayton Valley v. Steve Sisolak, Et Al,*

Supreme Court, No. 19A1070 (2020)

“This is a case about the CCP’s COVID19 bioweapon pandemic and the Supreme Court denying a request from Calvary Chapel Dayton Valley to hold religious services on the same terms as other facilities in the state (such as casinos). The Court intervene due to ‘Public Safety’ to reduce the CCP bioweapon pandemic’s dead tolls.” Also, approved format for booklets. Odd format violates margins of Rule 33(c), yet the petition was accepted by the US Supreme Court on July 08, 2020 and requested to be responded to on July 09, 2020 by the Fallen Justice Kagan, who is a Rule 40 violator (Veterans, Seamen, and Military Cases). Original Petitions followed this format.

*Alejandro Evaristo Perez v. LinkedIn Corporation,*

9th Circuit, No. 21-15234 (2021)

CAND, 5:20-cv-07238-EJD (2020)

“Pro Se Party appeals Judge’s 2015 California Anti-SLAPP Decision due to both substantive flaws and

procedural flaws like obsolete case, law, gross misrepresentation of the law, flawed arguments, avoided addressing the CCP's COVID19 bioweapon pandemic as a topic of public interest, and incorrect motion usage. The Fallen Judges' PREJUDICE and these corrupt actions can constitute Federal Treason for both Fallen Judges and unpatriotic Defendants."

**TXSD, 4:20-cv-02188 (2020)**

"The excommunication of an Honorable US Military Officer from a Social Media Platform on behalf of the Chinese Communist Party is not 'Free of Speech' violation, because the US Constitution limits the US Federal Government, not US Corporations, even if COVID19 bioweapon pandemic was created by the Chinese Communist Party as part of the 'Unrestricted Warfare' Multi Domain Doctrine."

***Schneider v. TRW, Inc.,***

**9th Circuit, 938 F. 2d 986, 992, (1991)**

“4 Elements Criteria for Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress (IIED). (1) the defendant must act intentionally or recklessly; (2) the defendant's conduct must be extreme and outrageous; and (3) the conduct must be the cause (4) of severe emotional distress.”

***Haines v. Kerner,***

**Supreme Court, No. 70-5025 (1972)**

“Pro Se Party's pleadings, requests, and motions should be entertained by all Federal Judges.”

***Resnick v. Hayes,***

**9th Circuit, 213 F.3d 443, 447 (2000)**

“Pro Se Party must be construed liberally.”

***McKinney v. De Bord***

**9th Circuit, 507 F.2d 501, 504, (1974)**

“Every reasonable or warranted factual inference in the Pro Se Party favor.”

***Faretta v. California***

**Supreme Court, No. 422 U.S. 806 (1975)**

“Pro Se Parties (ex. criminal defendants) have both a constitutional and statutory right to self-representation in any Federal Court.”

***USA v. Automated Medical Laboratories,***

**4<sup>th</sup> Circuit, 770 F.2d 399 (1985)**

“parent corporations can be convicted of subsidiary’s actions, even in attempts to disassociate or escape-goat employees.”

**USA v. Cincotta,**

**1st Circuit, 689 F.2d 238, 241-42 (1982)**

“criminal liability imposed on the corporations where the agents are acting within the scope of his employment.”

**State Of Oklahoma v Shriver,**

**US Supreme Court, 21-985 (2022)**

Sample format booklet offered by US Supreme Clerk Redmond Barnes to follow on 30 November 2022. The

US Supreme Court has accepted other formats is proof of corruption and violations of Pro Se caselaw.

**Sup. Ct. R. 40**

**Rule 40. Veterans, Seamen, and Military Cases.**

“A veteran suing under any provision of the law excepting veterans from the payment of fees or court costs, may proceed without prepayment of fees or costs of furnishing security therefore and may (optional) file a motion for leave to proceed on papers...”. Pro Se Party is an Honorable US War Veteran and an Honorable US Army Officer, and filed two motions; which the Court intentionally rejected and insulted the US War Hero.”

The Table of Authorities and the above are a snapshot and synopsis as a reminder to our Supreme Court Justices of following Statutes, Rules, and Case Law. To be fair, the Pro Se Petitioner will mention that the Pro Se Petitioner removed the Responder’s obsolete caselaw and Fallen

Judges' "out of scope" caselaw in order to facilitate the communication and avoid their legal ruses. It is very offensive to cite "sex-related" caselaw when this case is about an excommunication of an Honorable US War Veteran on behalf of CCP when warning about the CCP's bioweapon pandemic that is killing thousands of Americans and infesting millions more, which is the topic of public interest. It would be ideal to talk about caselaw that is relate to COVID19 bioweapon from the P4 Wuhan Laboratory like recent "Calvary Chapel Dayton Valley v. Steve Sisolak, Et Al, Supreme Court, No. 19A1070 (2020)". The Supreme Court intervene in the name of "Public Safety", so..... why not our Federal case?

---

†

## **INTRODUCTION & OATH**

On May of 2020, the Responder committed treason against the Pro Se Petitioner (a US Army Officer with an ETS for the year of 2059; and an Honorable War Veteran)

when destroying the Pro Se Petitioner's LinkedIn Profile on behalf of the evil Chinese Communist Party in order to stop any criticism and warnings of the COVID19 bioweapons created by Peter Daszak, a DARPA-Grant Reject, with the financial assistant from Anthony Fauci (NIH director) and the CCP's P4 Wuhan Virus Laboratory. As of 01 December 2022, the COVID19 bioweapon created by Peter Daszak within the CCP territory has killed over 6.6 million civilians; and thus, a "Topic of Public Issue" and "National Security" in US soil. In the US alone, the CCP's COVID19 bioweapon pandemic has killed over 1,088,349 American Citizens and infested over 98,673,988 American Citizens. The Pro Se Petitioner is a cool US Army Officer, Honorable War Veteran with a good heart, and, by coincidence, also a DARPA-Grant Reject for "Ghosts Invisibility Program: Invisible Equipment via Mesh Video Streaming for Invisible Cloaks, Armors, Drones, and Vehicles" as part of a modern military multi domain doctrine (BAA - HR001118S0028 # FP-30). American

Author Mark Twain did claim that the “truth is stranger than fiction”. For those reasons, our good hearted Pro Se Petitioner prefers to “construed broadly” the new California’s Anti-SLAPP Law claims as peaceful civic remedy and avoid hurting unpatriotic unethical treasonous Americans (the Responder and our Fallen Judges). Thus, treasonous Responder violated the new California’s Anti-SLAPP Law (e)(3) & (4) by excommunicating the Pro Se Petitioner’s LinkedIn account on behalf of the evil Chinese Communist Party. The Responder’s treacherous actions are the reasons the Pro Se Petitioner claimed the new California’s Anti-SLAPP Law violations with “Intentional Infliction of Emotion Distress” (IIED) as the “Course of Action” as a civic remedy. The IIED claims are based on 4 Elements Criteria set in “SCHNEIDER V. TRW, INC.”. On November of 2020, our Fallen Judge Canby, our Fallen Judge Tashima, and our Fallen Judge Miller affirmed the our Fallen Judge Davila’s Federal Decision of favoring the

treacherous Responder's case based on obsolete law, obsolete case law, flipping narratives, displaying complete disregard for actual language of the law, openly violated the "*shall be construed broadly*" mandate in the new 2015/2022 Anti-SLAPP laws, and technically cheating the Pro Se Petitioner from a peaceful civic resolution. How far have our Fallen Judges lowered themselves? Regardless of the treasonous Responder's excellent legal rhetoric (*the art of persuading Judges by telling them what they want to hear, instead of what is morally right and just.*), the end result is still the destruction and excommunication of the Pro Se Responder's LinkedIn Profile on behalf of the evil Chinese Communist Party, which is fundamentally wrong. It is true that harming, excommunicating, and denying services to Honorable American Heroes or any American in US soil on behalf of the evil Chinese Communist Party is wrong. If the Fallen Judge William C. Canby, the Fallen Judge Atsushi Tashima, our Fallen Judge Eric D. Miller, and Fallen Judge

Edward J. Davila continue to fail the “*shall be construed broadly*” mandate required in the new California Anti-SLAPP laws and continue to use illegal ruses (ex. quoting obsolete case law from 2006), then the Pro Se Petitioner will be forced to recommend to any Federal District Attorney Office enforce the US Code 18 Section 2381 “Treason” to all and any parties who showed PREJUDICE and agreed in aiding the enemies of the United States of America in excommunication activities. What else is an US Army Officer with an ETS of 2059 supposed to do with arrogant CCP saboteurs regardless of civic post? In 2009 and as commissioned by the President of the United States Barack Obama, the Pro Se Petitioner pledged the Oath of Commissioned Officers. Pro Se Party is fulfilling his Oath.

\_\_\_\_\_†\_\_\_\_\_

#### **STATEMENT OF THE CASE**

On 23 NOV 2021, the Pro Se Petitioner politely petitioned our unethical Responder, Fallen Judge Canby,

our Fallen Judge Tashima, our Fallen Judge Miller, and our Fallen Judge Davila via petition of en bank and for panel rehearsing. The petition offered another chance of a positive change of heart, align with the new California Anti-SLAPP laws, and to apologize to their cool US Army Hero. Otherwise, the Pro Se Petitioner will be forced by sacred oath to hand any treacherous parties to the Federal District Attorney Offices to enforce the US Code 18 Section 2381 "Treason", since he has been in oppression for over 700 days on behalf of the CCP. Those horrible actions are unpatriotic, offensive, and, above all, Federal treason. Instead of apologizing, on 03MAR2022, the Fallen Judges fell to lower standards by voting the denial of the petitions and refusing to change their treasonous decisions. Those treasonous actions can constitute aiding the CCP bioweapon pandemic and disinformation IAW with "Unrestricted Warfare" Multi Domain Doctrine. USAF Ret. General Robert Spalding address the CCP's military doctrine in his Amazon book,

“Stealth War” (2019), which includes censorship in US soil via bribing US Corporations and even retaliating against US celebrities that accepted the existence of Taiwan as an Independent Republic. IAW United States Court Of Appeals For The Ninth Circuit's *“After Opening Your Appeal: What You Need to Know PRO SE Appeals”* Guide (December 2019, edition), the Pro Se Petitioner has 90 days from that denial order or new decision to petition the U.S. Supreme Court to hear the case via Petition for Writ of Certiorari. The Pro Se Petitioner did so with the time frames repeatable only to be insulted with Rule 40 violations, US Code violations, caselaw violations, and docket mismanagement. Therefore, our brave Pro Se Petitioner provides a Notice of Petition for Writ of Certiorari to our sad Fallen Judges, who refused to change their dark hearts. The Pro Se Petitioner requests the resignation of our Fallen Judges, continues to offer to peacefully settle, and places the question of *“California Anti-SLAPP Laws and Federal Treason?”* on the hands of the

unreliable Supreme Court, who self-proclaim that they are the brightest minds of the Land when their actions prove otherwise. The Pro Se Party is open to Martial Law, because he is enraged the oppression (IIED) and the illegal ruses.

#### **CHOICE 1: California Anti-SLAPP Law Violation (e)**

**3 & 4?** The Pro Se Petitioner is assuming that he is talking with the brightest minds in the Land, so let's focus get down to business. What are the PROS and CONS that Californians have with their new Anti-SLAPP Laws? So... let's do some of that "shall be construed broadly" mandated by our Californianos? Especially when compared to Texas Anti-SLAPP laws, which are very strict in scope. Yes, only about "Motions to Strike" for Texans and thus jailed already for treason by such treasonous actions.

**PROS of California Anti-SLAPP Laws:** (1) Happier Informed Californians, because they technically have the best "Free Speech" Tort Defense Armory regard Public Issues; (2) Less unpatriotic Californians in Federal jails for

treason, because these laws are an alternative tort remedy to Federal crime of treason. This benefit is technically why the Responder and the Fallen Judges are not in jail right now by the DAs. So yeah, it's a real benefit for them are currently experiencing; (3) Increase Efficiency of California Courts by removes Censorship-Focus lawsuits (lawsuits meant to chill free speech and create chaos over free speech). (4) Californians can be proud they are leading the Free World with the highest standards of Free Speech in protection and administrative cleansing in order to focus on more important topics.

**CONS of California Anti-SLAPP Laws:** (1) Lack of Enforcement. Laws are only work when enforced. The Fallen Judges in California do not want to enforce their own new Anti-SLAPP laws due to monetary concerns, lack of patriotism, and due to catering to unethical corporatists, instead of been faithful to their own high standards. (2) Open Scopes confuses lesser minds. The multiple declarations,

“shall be construed broadly” mandate, and “Topics of Public Interest” in the new California Anti-SLAPP Laws are very open in scope and open to interpretations, which can create confusion for lesser minds. In comparison, Texas Anti-SLAPP laws are strictly in scope and confined to “Motions to Strike”, which is the false argument that the Responder and the Fallen Judges are making to the detriment of the new California Anti-SLAPP laws. Lesser minds that are confused on “open scopes” will swim to familiar shores. However, the Responder and Fallen Judges failed, because they are comparing a cheap row boat to a luxury yacht. Will the Fallen Judges make all Californians trade their luxury yachts for cheap row boats in the “Seas of Treason”?

**Anti-SLAPP Law Topics Avoided:** The 2015 and 2022 California Anti-SLAPP Laws are practically the same regarding Section 425.16(a) and (e). Our beloved Californios could have changed their Anti-SLAPP Laws and try to mimic the Texan’s Anti-SLAPP Laws, but did not. Our Californians

doubled-down on “shall be construed broadly” in both the 2015 version and the 2022 version against the Fallen Judges. The Responder and the Fallen Judges intentionally ignoring the 10 points below.

1. Attacking US Customers in US soil on behalf of the enemies of the United States is fundamentally wrong and dangerous to all Americans.
2. Anti-SLAPP Laws changed in 2015 and 2022, which supersede prior laws and supersede obsolete caselaw. In fact, the Californians Legislation keep the same language of the law with its "Construe Broadly" mandate.
3. The Responder quoted the obsolete version of Anti-SLAPP Laws and obsolete cases to attack Appellant’s 2015 & 2022 Anti-SLAPP Claims.
4. “Motions to Dismiss” does not equal “Motion to Strike”.

5. The Responder filed the wrong motion (a Motion to Dismiss) citing "Anti-SLAPP are Motions to Strike" false logic. The Petitioner claims are still alive.

6. The multiple motions in CAND District Court Docket validate that the Petitioners logic of "Anti-SLAPP Law Armory" with multiple declarations and "Open Scope" mandate of "Construe Broadly".

7. This Case is a "Matter of 1st Impression" regarding the new Anti-SLAPP Summary Judgement with a real Public Issue of a Global Pandemic.

8. The new Anti-SLAPP "Language of the Law" and its "Open Scope" mandate of "Construe Broadly" are above the Responder's obsolete caselaw, "Only a Motion to Strike" misinterpretations, and false limits.

9. The District Court Judge ignored obvious facts, limited the new California Anti-SLAPP laws, and jeopardized US National Security.

10. IIED - Intentional censoring of US military communities to help the enemies of the United States to facilitate a global pandemic does exceed all bounds tolerated by a civilized society based on "SCHNEIDER V. TRW, INC.".

**CHOICE 2: Federal Treason?** If excommunicating an Honorable US War Veteran for the evil Chinese Communist Party is not a violation of the new California Anti-SLAPP, then the other option is Federal treason, which is the scope of Criminal Law. If the Supreme Court agrees that the wrongful actions by the unethical Responder and the Fallen Judges are treason by aiding the evil Chinese Communist Party during a bioweapon deployment via censorship of Honorable US War Heroes warning about the CCP's bioweapon pandemic, then the Pro Se Petitioner will hand the traitors to the District Attorneys to be prosecuted under Criminal Law.

## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

The US Supreme Court may want to avoid the jailing of 4 Fallen Judges and (x) number of unpatriotic Corporatistas (starting with Ryan Roslansky, the CEO of LinkedIn) for treason while simultaneously reinforcing New California Anti-SLAPP Laws, which is currently the Free World's "Free Speech" highest standards and most diverse Tort Armory regard Public Issues and Topics of Public Interest. IF THE SUPREME COURT DENIES THIS RIGHTEOUS PETITION, THE PRO SE PETITIONER WILL ASSUME THAT THE UNETHICAL RESPONDER AND THE FALLEN JUDGES' WRONGFUL ACTIONS ARE FEDERAL TREASON, THAT THE SUPREME COURT DOES NOT WANT TO WASTE THEIR TIME ON TRAITORS, AND THAT THE PRO SE HAS EVERY RIGHT TO HAND THE TRAITORS TO THEIR RESPECTIVE DISTRICT ATTORNEYS TO BEGIN CRIMINAL

**PROSECUTION FOR TREASON ON TREASONOUS US**

**CIVILIANS.** If the Supreme Court is uncomfortable with choices presented, then please take your grievances to US President Joe Biden and/or US President Barack Obama who commissioned the Pro Se Petitioner as a US Army Military Officer in 2009 with an ETS date of 2059. US Senator John Cornyn (Texas - Republican) [Dallas\_Office@cornyn.senate.gov] and US Congresswoman Lizzie Fletcher (Texas - Democrat) [Fletcher.Officer@mail.house.gov] have been informed regarding LinkedIn's oppressive activities and our sad Fallen Judges, since they are the Petitioners' civilian jurisdictional leadership due to current location (Houston, TX – District 7). The DAs (ex. Kim Ogg, Dan Satterberg, Jeff Rosen, George Gascon) have been inform via da@dao.hctx.net, smckee@redmond.gov, jrosen@dao.sccgov.org, and

prosecuting.Attorney@kingcounty.gov, and  
info@da.lacounty.gov.

†

## CONCLUSION

The Supreme Court has to decide on the “California Anti-SLAPP Law violation or Federal Treason?” question. Did the Responder and Fallen Judges commit Federal Treason or a California Anti-SLAPP Law violation when excommunicating our Heroic Pro Se Petitioner for the evil Chinese Communist Party and aided the CCP bioweapon pandemic? If the petition is denied, the Pro Se Petitioner will assume the correct choice is Federal Treason and demand the jailing of the Fallen Judges and treasonous Responders’ stakeholders as required by US Military Officer Oath, Presidential Commission, and vows to God, the Creator of the Universe. After all, God, the Presidents of the United States of America, and the vow of the US Military Officer Oath are above the Fallen Judges and unpatriotic

Responders. Ideally, the Responders and Fallen Judges would apologize profusely, resign, never hold office, return the Pro Se Petitioner's LinkedIn Account with all 7,000 consenting contacts, and reward the Pro Se Petitioner the \$256BN check for his patience, coolness, and good heart. Or \$128BN for 50 years in jail for excommunicated an Honorable US Army Officer for the evil Chinese Communist Party and intentionally aiding the CCP's bioweapon pandemic that has killed millions. 100 years in jail if no reparations are provided. In accordance with "USA V. AUTOMATED MEDICAL LABORATORIES" 770 F.2d 399 [1985] and "USA V. CINCOTTA", 689 F.2d 238, 241-42 [1982], the list of traitors with criminal liability as follows: LinkedIn Corporation, Microsoft Corporation (Parent Company who failed to correct subsidiary), Traitor Ryan Roslansky (LinkedIn's CEO), Traitor Satya Nadella (Microsoft's CEO), Traitor Bill Gates (Microsoft's Cofounder [1<sup>st</sup> employee] with Microsoft Shares), Traitor Jason Skaggs

(evil legalist), Traitor Steve J. Mitby (evil legalist), Traitor Megan Bibb Rapp (evil legalist), Traitor Edward J. Davila (Fallen Judge), Traitor Atsushi Tashima, Traitor Eric D. Miller (Fallen Judge), and Traitor William C. Canby (Fallen Judge). The Rule 40 Violators should immediately resign to avoid similar dark fates of traitors. The Pro Se Petitioner provides safe passage if taken.

\_\_\_\_\_†\_\_\_\_\_

#### **APPENDIX & ADMIN REQUIREMENTS**

Any Appendixes and additional documents are the different decisions and administrative items are in uploaded in the Ninth Circuits' PACER-CM/ECF System and other cases associated in the CAND and TXSD. The Pro Se Petitioner requires the US Supreme Court to obey our US Codes, our US Supreme Court Rules, caselaws, and in the Table of Authorities. All Pro Se Party's petitions, pleadings, requests, and motions should entertained by all Federal Judges, which is the Pro Se Party's Constitutional and

Statutory Right. These “Pro Se Friendly” case law (*Haines v. Kerner*; *Resnick v. Hayes*; *McKinney v. De Bord*; *Faretta v. California*) and waivers includes all paperwork, administrative requirements, docketing, and processing. These case law includes applies to US Supreme Court Rule 29 “Filing and Service of Documents; Special Notifications; Corporate Listing”; Rule 33.2 “Document Preparation: Booklet Format; 8 1/2 – by 11 inch Paper Format”, Rule 34 “Document Preparation: General Requirements”, and the use of Rule 40 “Veterans, Seamen, and Military Cases” to comply for Rule 38 “Fees” and Rule 43 “Costs”. The petition meets the limits of the “under 40 opaque, unglazed white pages” with around 4,904 words IAW Rule 33. Appendices updated IAW Court’s September 20, 2022 feedback to match previously approved appendices of match “CALVARY CHAPEL DAYTON VALLEY V STEVE SISOLAK” (19A1070) format which violates margins of rule 33(c), yet the petition was accepted by the US Supreme Court on July

08, 2020 and requested to be responded to on July 09, 2020 by the Fallen Justice Kagan, who is a Rule 40 violator. The Pro Se Party and Court communicated on November 14, 2022 regarding uploading the petition, but Court failed without real feedback. On 30 November 2022, the Court violated US Code Title 28, § 1654 by denying the Pro Se Party access to file on their own Federal docket and attempting to change formats via "State Of Oklahoma v Shriver" booklet sample. The Pro Se Party tries to comply.

As required by US Supreme Court Rule 33.2, the original of any such document shall be signed by the party proceeding Pro Se or under any other applicable federal statute (ex. Title 5 U.S. Code 3331 "Military Officer Oath").

God bless America,

By:

Alejandro Evaristo Perez

18JAN2023

Date

PRO SE PETITIONER, US VETERAN, ARMY OFFICER,  
AUTHOR, INNOVATOR, MAN AFTER GOD'S HEART