

ORIGINAL

NO. _____

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

FILED

MAR 13 2023

**OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.**

JAMES CONERLY, MARILYN TILLMAN-CONERLY, CARINA CONERLY,

AND MINOR M.T. — PETITIONERS

v.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, E.T. AL.— RESPONDENTS

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

TO UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT OF CALIFORNIA

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORI

JAMES CONERLY, MARILYN TILLMAN-CONERLY,

CARINA CONERLY, AND MINOR M.T.

1501 AMAZON AVENUE

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95835-1929

RECEIVED
MAR 16 2023
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

(916) 595-2210 or (916) 704-6755

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- 1. WHETHER**, the Ninth Circuit Court “Abused in its Discretion with its Findings, Recommendations and Judgment/Orders concerning this Case at hand?
- 2. WHETHER**, the Ninth Circuit Court “Abused in its Discretion in failing to examine Petitioners’ Due Process Issues, and make a Ruling on the **Due Process** issues in the case at hand?
- 3. WHETHER**, the Ninth Circuit Court “Abused in its Discretion with Findings, Recommendations and Judgment/Orders concerning the Prior “**Related Cases**?
- 4. WHETHER**, the Ninth Circuit Court “Abused in its Discretion in failing to examine Petitioners’ Due Process Issues, and make a Ruling on the **Due Process** issues in the Prior “**Related Cases**”?
- 5. WHETHER**, the Ninth Circuit Court “Abused in its Discretion in failing to examine Petitioners’ **Systemic Racism** Issues in the case at hand?
- 6. WHETHER**, the Ninth Circuit Court “Abused in its Discretion in failing to examine Petitioners’ “**Systemic Racism**” Issues in the Prior “**Related Cases**?

7. WHETHER, the Ninth Circuit Court Abused its Discretion in finding that Petitioners did not present a case that had "**Subject Matter Jurisdiction**" in The Case at Hand?

8. WHETHER, the Ninth Circuit Court Abused its Discretion in finding not recognizing that Petitioners Cases (Prior Related and Case at Hand) were and are under the Constitutional Questions/Issues before the Federal Court and not Family Law Resolutions?

9. WHETHER, the issuing of an "**Order**" that requires a United States Citizen to refrain from [videotaping in public places] application of his/her Constitutional Right [under the First Amendment] that is Guaranteed to Petitioners is a Violation of Petitioners Constitutional Right [under the First Amendment]?

10. WHETHER, "**Judicial Immunity**" is rightly applicable to a Judicial Officer who make an Order that when applied, it restricts a citizen from enjoyment of a Constitutional exercise, that right is properly prohibited by the Judicial Officer?

11. WHETHER, the Eastern District Court Abused its Discretion by denying Petitioners Defaults rulings when Respondents failed to Answer Complaints after having been properly served with Summons and Complaint?

12. WHETHER, the Eastern District Court Abused its Discretion by denying

Petitioners Ex Parte Hearings when a need to protect a child in the case at hand?

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:

No. _____

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

JAMES CONERLY, MARILYN TILLMAN-CONERLY, CARINA CONERLY,

—PETITIONERS

VS.

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO,

NORA WILLIAMS, JOGINDER DHILLON, JUNE D. COLEMAN, LAURI

DAMRELL, TRISH HIGGINS, SHAW LAW GROUP, PC,

DARCY MASLOW, DEREK DANIELS, DEREK BONDURANT, CALSTRS,

**LESLIE CARTER-PADILLA, CHRISTINE MARTINEZ, JOSHUA
GOLDSMITH,**

**CASSANDRA LICHNOCK, DAVID TODD WALTON, ANA JESSICA
MOSQUEDA,**

**BIANCA NOVOA, STEPHANIE HILL, MELISSA NORCIA, LABOR
RELATIONS,**

ERAINA ORTEGA, KARLA BROUSSARD-BOYD, MAKAY BUTZ,

**STACY MIRANDA, CALHR, LEZLIE UKO, SEIU LOCAL 1000, BRANDI
LOPES,**

SCIF, LIEN QUOC TRAN, ANDREW K. LEE, TERI L. TROLIO, ANGELA M.

DIAZ, LASSANE BONKOUNGOU, SHARIF ROLDAN TARPIN, KAISER

PERMANENTE, SABRINA V KO, PEDRO LEON, AMY LOUISE GOSSETT,

**NICOLE NADDY, CME, PAUL GURPAL SANDHU, CHARMAYNE
ACEITUNO,**

VERACITY RESEARCH COMPANY, KRISTY MICHELLE TORAIN, SEIU

INTERNATIONAL, MARY KAY HENRY, TIFFANY MORRIS, AMERICAN

RENOVATION CENTER, HAIM BLOKH, AND BESSIDA TAONDA

-RESPONDENTS.

RELATED CASES

All Cases Listed above and 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 KJM

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 14th (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. NO. 2:20-CV-00950 TLN-KJN,

E. OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MGT. CASE 9TH 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, 9th Circ. No. 22-

15221

H. YANG CASE D.C. NO. 2-21-CV-01618, 9th Cir. No. 2-15281

I. YAP CASE D.C. NO. 2:21-CV- 1132, 9TH CIR. No. 21-17041

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

01525

**1st. FILED: JUNE 4, 2019 BY PLAINTIFFS CARINA CONERLY,
AND M.T.(CC AND MT)**

DECISION/ORDER DATE: COMBINED WITH NEXT CASE No. 01113

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

NINTH CIRCUIT CASE NO. 2017029

2nd. 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

3rd. FILED: DECEMBER 17, 2019 BY: JC, MC, CC M.T.

DECISION/ORDER DATE: September 3, 2021

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

NINTH CIRCUIT CASE NO. 21-16603

4th. 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. _____

5th. 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

6th. 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

7th. 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

8th. 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

9th 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

10th. 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

11th FILED: AUGUST 30, 2022, FILED BY PLAINTIFFS, JC, MT-C, CC AND

MINOR M.T DECISION/ORDERS DATE

THE CONSTITUTIONAL LAWS BROKEN BY THE INFERIOR COURTS

BEING TREATED LIBERALLY AS PRO SE PLAINTIFFS, NEVER

HAPPENED FOR PLAINTIFFS EITHER OF US [PLAINTIFFS HEREIN]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....	12
JURISDICTION.....	12-13
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	13-14
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	14-15
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	15-17
CONCLUSION.....	17

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A₁ MANDATE

A₂ ORDER of the Ninth Circuit District Court of California to Dismiss Appeal

A₃ MEMORANDUM

APPENDIX B₁ JUDGMENT of California Eastern District Court Dismissing Petitioners Case

B₂ ORDER

APPENDIX C₁ HISTORY of the Case

C₂ DOCKET

APPENDIX D₁₋₈ PETITIONERS' OPPOSITIONS to all RESPONDENTS

APPENDIX E PETITIONERS' REPLY TO RESPONDENTS' REPLY

APPENDIX F₁ PETITIONERS' CIVIL COMPLAINT

F₂ PETITIONERS' SELECTION TO AMEND COMPLAINT

F₃ PETITIONERS SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT

**APPENDIX G PETITIONERS' OBJECTION TO MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**APPENDIX H APPELLANTS'/PETITIONERS INFORMAL OPENING BRIEFS IN
THE NINTH CIRCUIT COURT**

I APPELLANTS REPLY TO APPELLEE'S VERACITY RESEARCH

J APPELLANTS' REPLY TO ALL APPELLEE'S EXCEPT RESEARCH

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
Knicks vs. Township of Scott, Pa. 139 S. Ct. 2162 (2019)	13,14
STATUTES AND RULES	
1st Amendment to the U.S. Constitution	14, 15
5th Amendment to U.S. Constitution	14, 15
14th Amendment to U.S. Constitution	14, 15
Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, (42 USC Section 2000e)	14
Wrongful Employment Termination	14, 15
Race Black Discrimination	14,15
Government Conspiracy	14,15,16

Evidence Tampering.....	14,15
Property Damages	14,15
Personal Injury	14,15,16
Stalking (Lay and Wait).....	14, 16
Systemic Racism	14,15

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

[X] 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,
[X] 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,
[X] 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 13, 2023, MANDATE: January 14, 2023**.

Knick vs. Township of Scott Pennsylvania 139 S. Ct. 2162 (2019)

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. ____ A ____.

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

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Knicks vs. Township of Scott, Pa.139 S. Ct. 2162 (2019)

5th Amendment to U.S. Constitution	14th Amendment to U.S. Constitution
Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964,	(42 USC Section 2000e)
Wrongful Employment Termination	Race Black Discrimination
Government Conspiracy	Evidence Tampering
Property Damages	Personal Injury
Stalking (Lay and Wait)	42 USC 1983 (Government Conspiracy)

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

**On 12/17/2019, Plaintiffs/Appellants/Petitioners Carina Conerly, Minor
M.T., James Conerly, and Marilyn Tillman-Conerly Filed Suit in the United
States Eastern District Court of Sacramento, California. Thereafter, these
Pro Se Plaintiffs were not treated liberally.**

**Please take notice that the lower inferior courts, with the help of each other lower courts
and other agencies, skillfully created and worked together to keep power and control of
different kinds of other conjured-up cases by un-lawfully intermingling non-family law**

matters and cases into a false family law issues (conspiring with each other to cleverly working together, diverting matters, and issues' attention away from the law suits of Constitutional Issues [example given: Petitioners' major Complaint concerns violations of Petitioners' Right to Due Process done by the State of California employment issues and matters as Race/Black First Amendment Rights, Right to video tape incidents of Respondents, as proof of wrong doings by Respondents and California Officials joining in when the Cases are filed within the various lower Courts [e.g. Systemic Discrimination]. Petitioners' cases concerning related assaults and battery upon Petitioners, cases of attempted murder upon Petitioners, cases of threats to kill Petitioners, threats and attempt to cause Petitioners to wreck have car wrecks and Petitioner to actually wreck while driving on freeways and local streets; in at least three occasions, where Respondents created to involve Petitioners into staged accidents; Petitioner reported the incident to the police, but police failed to take any action. , Petitioners reported incidents of "Forged Documents" that Respondents (without legal consent) illegally used to unlawfully enroll Petitioners' child into a school. Petitioners obtained a copy of the frauded and forged registration to the two schools and the police. The schools failed to take the correct actions; the police did not act appropriately, although Petitioners tried told the police that they(Petitioners) were pressing charges. The police listed the incidents as Family Law Matters in order for the State to wrongly consider that the Family Law division could assert jurisdiction, and shield Respondents from punishment and a civil or criminal record. The main purpose was for State of California to prevent Petitioners from filing charges outside of its jurisdiction and control, especially because Petitioners are already suing the State and Family Law officials of violating Petitioners' Constitutional Due Process Rights

By means of Government Conspiracy, which also included other Constitutional Rights of Petitioners that were violated. Petitioners reported Civil and Criminal Acts cases that were related to this Case at-hand. The State of California did not want the Federal Issues to leave its control.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Petitioners and Petitioners' Case has been subjected to Deprivation of a Constitutional Right to Government Employment Termination without the Right of Proper Due Process before adverse action (Wrongful Termination of Government Employment) of Employer's terminating Petitioner Carina Conerly without rightful and lawful application for Petitioner Carina Conerly to prove her Termination to be done by wrongful allegations and application of employment laws and failure of Employer to abide by the rules of termination. Furthermore, Petitioners, Carina Conerly, Minor M.T., Petitioner James Conerly, and Marilyn Tillman-Conerly have all received person's injuries, damaged by Government's wrong seizing of Petitioners Homes by Bogus Property Liens, home and property damages and destructions, being stalked by un-licensed Private Investigator obtained by Petitioner Carina Conerly's Government Employment. The Employer's addition of more government individuals, agencies, and outside helpers who has and continue to injure Petitioners' Person (body attacks) and Petitioners' Home and Properties [example given: Petitioners' home and automobiles bugged, broken engines, transmissions, and body, homes broken into and damaged. Petitioners computers hacked, security systems damaged and destroyed, staged automobile accidents, printers, electronic devices

and necessities interfered with, lives threatened, interferences with Petitioners Producing Federal Documents and things, Neighborhood terrorization and lives threatened. The local Police being co-helpers with their head government agencies. Moreover, the people involves people of many various race, age, gender, and some of which are not being the type who will be easily stopped, in other-words they have enjoyed the wrong doings so much that it is a fun and funded thing that it has become a way of personal enjoyment because of the fact that they do feel the freedom due to the government hire of them with provided with fleet automobiles, rental automobiles, no requirement to have license plates on their automobiles, and some with out of state automobile license and registration with such as unlawful darkened glass and windows, and much more disguise of some of the criminals and co-conspirators involved. Not last nor least, the home terrorization, computer and phone hacking, property damages, automobile chasing us and endangering our lives goes on and on and it continues to worsen when the courts have given Petitioners a deadline date to perform or comply with and court order. At this point, Petitioners choose to stay the rest of damages and herm; however, **Petitioners will provide the much obtained proof to support all that we have stated herein.**

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

James Conerly

Marilyn Tillman-Conerly

Carina Conerly

Date: March, /3, 2023