Case No. 22 - 7800

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Dmt MACTRUONG,
Appellant-Petitioner

v.

Governor Mike DEVINE, *et al.*
Appellees-Respondents

On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the
United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Dmt MacTruong, J.S.D., Ph.D., LL.M., Petitioner *pro se*
875 Bergen Avenue
Jersey City, NJ 07306
(914) 215-2304
Email: dmtforest@aol.com

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Does Petitioner, Dmt MacTruong, a male U.S. citizen living in New Jersey, have standing to sue in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Ohio, Western Division, fourteen Defendants, six of whom reside in Ohio, or Indiana, the rest in Washington, DC, who have maliciously and discreetly acted in concert to achieve their Trumpist MAGA racist and **misogynist** agenda for America by making unconstitutional anti-abortion legislation in violation of Petitioner's original copyrighted intellectual property entitled the CCO Network that was minutely and articulately expressed as a legal playwright scenario in two tangible media [4 printed pages, A: 11-14, and a 2014 4-hour full-feature motion picture available 24/7 on DMTMOVIES.COM, [A: 25-28] to help law enforcers to effectively detect and prosecute criminal conspiracies?

2. Does Petitioner, Dmt MacTruong, a male U.S. citizen living in New Jersey, have standing to respectfully and urgently request that this U.S. Supreme Court declares null and void Respondents' April 11 2019 self-styled Ohio's Human Rights and Heartbeat Protection Act (HRHPA), which bans abortion in the State of Ohio after the embryonic cardiac activity is detectable, and/or any similar or related anti-abortion legislation, and/or any U.S. State's statutes banning almost all types of abortions, which were and still are legal and allowed by this Court's 1973 Constitutional *Roe v. Wade* ruling?

3. In the event all elected Democratic and Republican representatives and leaders of America have publicly failed to perform their duties of defending and upholding the most important values, highest goals, and principles of the U.S. Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, would a U.S. citizen have both the sacred duty and legal standing to move a U.S. Court of competent jurisdiction or ultimately this USSC to unmask and hold accountable racist and misogynist criminals, such as the Respondents herein, who have acted in concert under color of State law by misrepresentations of fact or law to rape and murder innocent child-bearing-aged (CBA) women, sometimes as young as 10 years of age, in egregious violation of their constitutional rights to life, liberty, property, privacy, and the pursuit of happiness, the 13th and 14th Amendments to the U.S. Constitution, the 1866 and 1964 Civil Rights Acts, and the constitutional *Roe v. Wade* ruling by this Court in 1973?

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING

There are no other parties than those named in the full caption, to wit:

Dmt MACTRUONG, Appellant-Petitioner

Appellees-Respondents:

Mike DeWine, Ohio Governor,
Dave Yost, Ohio Attorney General,
Ohio Senator Rob McColley,
Ohio Senator Kristina Roegner,
Ohio Rep Jean Schmidt,
Todd Rokita, Indiana Atty Gen.
Donald J. Trump, Former U.S. President
Virgina Thomas, Wife of Justice Thomas,
Justice Brett M. Kavanaugh,
Justice Neil M. Gorsuch,
Justice Amy Coney Barrett,
Justice Samuel Alito.
Justice Clarence Thomas,
Chief Justice John Roberts.

RULE 29.6 STATEMENT

Petitioner MacTruong is an individual. I have no stocks for any private or publicly traded company to own 10% or more.

OPINIONS BELOW

In substance, the USCA6 finds that Dmt MacTruong, a New Jersey resident proceeding *pro se,* appealed from a final judgment of the U.S. District Court, Southern District of Ohio, Western Division, dismissing his civil complaint to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

In substance, the USCA6 determines that MacTruong's complaint named fourteen defendants, including five Ohio government officials, six Supreme Court justices, and former President Donald Trump. Plaintiff MacTruong generally alleged that the defendants (1) violated his intellectual property rights in the "Community Civic Officers Network," which he claims is proposed legislation that would prevent criminals from acting in concert, and (2) violated his rights and the rights of others by acting to restrict abortion rights through Ohio's Human Rights & Heartbeat Protection Act and *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Org.,* 142 S. Ct. 2228 (2022). MacTruong sought monetary, declaratory, and injunctive relief. Upon initial screening, the District Court (1) dismissed all plaintiffs other than MacTruong because they did not sign the complaint and he could not represent them in his *pro se* capacity, (2) dismissed with prejudice his intellectual property claims, concluding that they were frivolous and failed to state a claim upon which relief could be granted, and (3) dismissed without prejudice the abortion-related claims because MacTruong lacked standing to assert them.

In substance, without any elaborate rational and/or factual explanation, the USCA6 dismissed MacTruong's appeal after the Court's conclusory finding that it lacks an arguable basis in law or in fact. The Court finds without any credible evidence that the District Court properly dismissed MacTruong's claims alleging violations of his intellectual property rights, given his clearly baseless and wholly incredible factual allegations and the absence of allegations establishing the violation of a protected legal interest.

Finally, the USCA6 finds that the District Court properly dismissed MacTruong's remaining claims for lack of standing because he did not allege facts establishing that he suffered a concrete and particularized injury that is actual or imminent resulting from *Dobbs,* Ohio's Human Rights & Heartbeat Protection Act, or the Defendants' other alleged actions.

JURISDICTION

(1) Basis of this USSC's Subject-Matter Jurisdiction:

28 USCS §1254 provides that cases in the U.S. Courts of Appeals may be reviewed by the Supreme Court by writ of certiorari granted upon the petition of any party to any civil or criminal case, before or after rendition of judgment or decree. Plaintiff-Petitioner herein appeals from the following final order(s) of the **USCA6: 5/16/2023 Doc # N/A – USCA6 - ORDER [See, A: 1]**

1. Brief Statement of the Case.

1. This action was initiated on or about July 18, 2022, in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Ohio, Western Division. Case No. 2:22-CV-2908-MHW-KAJ.

2. Petitioner, Dmt MacTruong, came to Manhattan, New York in 1974 from Paris, France. I was a naturalized U.S. citizen in 1980 in New York. I have lived in New Jersey since 1989, but always practiced law in New York City. Petitioner herein proceeded *pro se* and brought this action against **NONE** of any U.S. State of the Union, but only against 6 high-ranking officials of the State of Ohio, to wit Mike DeWine, Dave Yost, Rob McColley, Kristina Roegner, Jean Schmidt, Indiana Attorney General Todd Rokita, former President Donald J. Trump, and Virginia Thomas, wife of SCOTUS Justice Clarence Thomas, and 6 SCOTUS Justices Brett M. Kavanaugh, Neil M. Gorsuch, Amy Coney Barrett, Samuel Alito, Clarence Thomas, and John Roberts, for having acted in concert, hence committed a serious federal felony of conspiracy, as a MAGA **misogynist** group, to violate Plaintiff's undisputed copyrighted intellectual property entitled **THE CCO NETWORK [See, A: 11-14],** and the constitutional rights to life, liberty, property, privacy, and the pursuit of happiness of millions of childbearing-aged (CBA) women, who may happen to reside temporarily or permanently in the U.S. State of Ohio.

3. **Even though, Summons and Complaints have been duly served on all Defendants herein, none of them have appeared or served an answer.** This proceeding was assigned to Magistrate Judge Kimberly A. Jolson of the Court, who granted Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Proceed *in forma pauperis* (Doc. 1) and proceeded with the initial screen of Plaintiff's Complaint (Doc. 1-1) under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2).

4. Judge Jolson **RECOMMENDED on August 16, 2022,** that the Court **DISMISS** Plaintiff's Complaint (Doc. 1-1) as **frivolous, [A: 10-a-10-e]** based on her honor's absolutely personal arbitrary and irrational findings that

> ***(I)t "lacks 'an arguable basis either in law or in fact.'" (...) "This occurs when "indisputably meritless" legal theories underlie the complaint, or when a complaint relies on "fantastic or delusional" allegations. (...) "a court is not required to accept factual allegations set forth in a complaint as true when such factual allegations are "clearly irrational or wholly incredible." (...) "A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged." (...) In sum, although pro se complaints are to be construed liberally, (...) "basic pleading essentials" are still required."*** **[A: 10-a - 10-b]**

5. Magistrate Judge Jolson then discussed as follows:

> ***"Plaintiff's allegations seem to be motivated by his disagreement with the recent Supreme Court case Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization, which overruled Roe v. Wade. (See e.g., Doc. 1-1, ¶¶ 54, 67). He brings this case against fourteen state and federal officials, including Ohio Governor Mike DeWine, several Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, and former President Donald J. Trump. (Id., ¶¶ 28–41). (...) The central allegation in Plaintiff's complaint is that Defendants are co-conspirators in a plot to defeat Roe v. Wade. (Id. at 21–23). He seeks thirty-six billion dollars in damages on behalf of NARAL Pro-Choice America, in addition to damages for himself. (Id. at 22–23). He also requests that the Defendant Justices immediately resign or "be impeached and tried with due process for attempted mass murder, treason, and perjury ..." (...)***

> ***Plaintiff's Complaint contains a wide range of unintelligible accusations, and seemingly false and irrelevant details. (...) At base, Plaintiff's Complaint provides insufficient factual content or context from which the Court could reasonably infer that Defendants violated his rights. Accordingly, he has failed to satisfy the basic federal pleading requirements set forth in Rule 8(a). (...) Moreover, these allegations are so nonsensical as to render his Complaint frivolous. As detailed above, a claim is frivolous if it lacks "an arguable basis either in law or in fact." (...) The former occurs when "indisputably meritless" legal theories underlie the complaint, and the latter when it relies (sic) on "fantastic or delusional" allegations. (...) This Court is not required to accept the factual allegations set forth in a complaint as true when such factual allegations are "clearly irrational or wholly incredible." (...) Ultimately, Plaintiff's allegations "constitute the sort of patently insubstantial claims" that deprive the Court of subject matter jurisdiction. (...) Because Plaintiff's Complaint is premised on such incomprehensible allegations, the Undersigned finds he has failed to state a plausible claim for relief, and it is RECOMMENDED that this action be DISMISSED as frivolous. (...)*** **[A: 10-b - 10-d]**

6. Plaintiff timely filed my objection to Magistrate Judge Jolson's foregoing Report and Recommendation. It shows that, after all, my Complaint is very simple, factual, rational, and meritorious. None of the factual allegations found unbelievable, hence untrue, by Judge Jolson, such as I was recommended by several U.S. Senators in 1993 to President Clinton to sit at SCOTUS, **[A: 15, 16, 17]** or I had "created the 'greatest movie of all time,' starring Britney Spears, Clint Eastwood, and Ronald Reagan—who would have been deceased at the time" (...) were false or even exaggerated. **[See, A: 25-28]** Any difficulty for Judge Jolson to understand my writing or new inventions was undoubtedly due to **(i)** her honor's lack of vision, open-mindedness, and a general cultural, social, and political education, on top of her biases and prejudices against a colored Asian plaintiff, **(ii)** her belief in the same conservative racist and **misogynist** intellectual background as that of the Defendants-Respondents herein, **(iii)** her failure to have an open mind to figure out for instance that a modern original creative movie maker, such as the Plaintiff-

Petitioner herein, can make a deceased movie superstar such as Ronald Reagan play himself posthumously by writing an appropriate scenario and using adequate special effects, which are extremely advanced nowadays because of available amazing AI (Artificial Intelligence) in software writing, **[See, A 32-40]** on file with the Court or annexed hereto for the link to immediately go to DMTMOVIES.COM to watch SUPERHUMANKIND IN ACTION THE MOVIE, that is mentioned by Magistrate Judge Jolson, from anywhere on earth 24/7,**]** **(iv)** her honor's failure to handle relevant fundamental legal concepts and an appropriate method of reasoning, which is, for one sure thing, no more that of classical Aristotle, the greatest teacher of philosophy, metaphysics, and logic combined of all time. That is until Absolute Relativity the Ph.D. thesis was written and presented at the Sorbonne by Appellant-Petitioner in France in 1972.

7. Such lack of knowledge, vision, creativity, and a failure to reason properly have rendered Judge Jolson unable to understand and/or resolve the issues being raised in this proceeding, which, to be fair, have also baffled many legal scholars, including 6 SCOTUS Justices, Defendants-Respondents herein, who in *Dobbs v. Jackson,* do not show they have a better legal and general educational background than Judge Jolson, something that is definitely the reason why American current justice system has been unfortunately in an undeserving shameful shamble, with so many judges, legislators, and law enforcers, like most of the Respondents herein, being subject to much violence or threats thereof. **[See, A: 41-44]**

8. Incidentally, Judge Jolson may surely not understand that if the American government is not biased or prejudiced against Petitioner herein for being a Vietnamese American, but trust me with the position of a U.S. deputy Attorney General, I will lead a group of legal software writers using artificial intelligence to apply my rule of ideal human behavior called RPR in AR **[See, A: 32-40]** to detect within minutes any law or order that is unconstitutional, or illegal, or unfair or unjust,

and as such, the U.S. justice system will be most of the time fair just and transparent to the American people and thereafter to all humankind, as it always ideally should, and no frustration or violence against incompetent or corrupted judges would be warranted or welcomed.

9. Our country in general, undoubtedly, needs a fresh revolutionary taking over by a new great American free and liberating spirit such as in 1776 and 1861, except that this time, as it will be more clearly expressed hereinafter, no violence or bloodshed is required. Only universal education, vision, reason, determination, good faith, and creativity are.

10. For now, sadly but expectedly, on or about October 17, 2022, Presiding District Judge Michael H. Watson, who did not show a better understanding of the issues, granted a final order without any disagreement with Judge Jolson's nonsensical and delusional Report and Recommendation. The Court heartily approved the R&R findings of fact and conclusions of law, then dismissed Plaintiff's Complaint, practically based solely on the following finding, his honor must have told himself, obviously factual and indisputable: ***"Plaintiff has not shown that he has standing to bring this claim as a man who resides in New Jersey. The complaint asserts that women's constitutional rights have been violated, but does not allege that Plaintiff has suffered an injury." (...) "For at least the above reasons, Plaintiff's Complaint fails as a matter of law. Accordingly, the court ADOPTS the R&R and DISMISSES Plaintiff's Complaint. His copyright and patent claims are DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE; his substantive due process claim is DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE."*** **[See, A: 9,** The Court's 10/17/2022 Order on file with the Court or annexed to the Notice of Appeal.]

11. Plaintiff timely appealed to the USCA6 from District Judge Michael H. Watson's foregoing Dismissal Order, **[A: 2-9,]** which, for reasons hereinafter crystally explained to this noble USSC, must be reversed for the sake of truth and

justice for not only Plaintiff-Petitioner herein and all CBA women in Ohio, but also for all American and the human future world of mutual understanding, vision, universal partnership, peace, harmony, creativity, and wonderful happiness.

12. Statement of Facts Relevant to the Issues Presented for Review.

1. In Plaintiff's Complaint [Doc 1.1], and Objection to R&R, Petitioner herein alleges in substance that I was naturalized U.S. citizen in 1980, after I had been sworn in to bear arms, i.e., to violently kill or be killed, if required by law, to defend the United States of America, including every State of the Union, be it New Jersey where I now reside permanently, or Ohio of which I am not a citizen, against any foreign invasion or domestic insurrection or conspiracy to overthrow the U.S. Government either by armed forces or by criminal activities such as keeping false government and/or court records or by the extensive use of material misrepresentation of facts and/or controlling legal authorities, and/or by patent abuse of power to irresponsibly and recklessly abridge the most basic constitutional rights to life, liberty, property, privacy, and the pursuit of happiness of every U.S. citizen, but not only of New Jersey, where I reside, and/or to fundamentally undermine the patriotic faith of the American people in the federal republican democratic and liberal form of government of the United States of America, undisputedly and rationally embodied in the U.S. Constitution. Plaintiff-Petitioner also alleges that he is the father of a successful international fashion designer and U.S.-born married child-bearing-aged (CBA) beautiful daughter, who is absolutely concerned about the anti-abortion legislation that is being adopted by about half of the States of the Union, including the State of Ohio that is both governed and criminally betrayed by five of the Defendants-Respondents herein.

2. Viewing the foregoing, since Petitioner has been under oath to bear arms to kill or be killed to defend the USA and the constitutional rights of all U.S. citizens, including those of Ohio, it is as such proven beyond a reasonable doubt that I have standing to sue Defendants herein for having acted in concert to defeat *Roe v. Wade* and make anti-abortion legislation to put millions of CBA female Ohioan citizens in lethal reckless endangerment.

3. In my pleadings against all the Respondents herein, Petitioner further alleges and undisputedly proves that Respondents have relied on my copyrighted original intellectual property entitled the CCO Network **[See, A: 11-14,** on file with the District Court or annexed hereto] to incentivize private citizens to denounce and prosecute people who would have assisted pregnant women in aborting.

Statement of Issues.

a. **First Issue:** *Petitioner has no standing to sue the U.S. State of Ohio because I am a resident of New Jersey.*

Argument and Authorities: The USCA6's foregoing finding, and determination are incorrect as a matter of fact and law. Nowhere in the Complaint has Plaintiff made the State of Oklahoma a defendant in this civil action. Also, nowhere in the entire U.S. Constitution is it written that an individual U.S. citizen plaintiff may not sue another individual U.S. citizen in another State in a U.S. federal court for alleged violation of federal laws.

Regarding this issue, it is further pertinent to read the following excerpt of research made by two acknowledgeable professors of Constitutional Law: ***While the States continue to enjoy broad sovereign immunity from suit, the Supreme Court does allow suits against state officers in certain circumstances, thus mitigating the effect of sovereign immunity. In particular, the Court does not read the Amendment to bar suits against state officers that seek court orders to prevent future violations of federal law. Moreover, suits by other states, and suits by the United States to enforce federal laws, are also permitted. The Eleventh Amendment is thus an important part, but only a part, of a web of constitutional doctrines that shape the nature of judicial remedies against states and their officials for alleged violations of law.*** [See, Published Article **by Bradford R. Clark,** William Cranch Research Professor of Law, George Washington University Law School, and by **Vicki C. Jackson,** Thurgood Marshall Professor of Constitutional Law at the Harvard Law School.]

Last but not least, since the **lack-of-standing argument to dismiss a complaint is an affirmative defense to be made by Defendants herein based on a provable finding of fact, if any, to be accepted by**

the Court regarding the absence of a tangible monetizable injury or damage resulting from Defendants' alleged violation of Petitioner's intellectual property rights, which is fully alleged in my complaint but undisputed due to Respondents' calculated failure to appear in Court to oppose by setting forth an affirmative defense to that effect, it is settled law that the Court will not take the matter upon itself to deny a complaint without a defense motion to dismiss for lack of standing. Indeed, as a matter of law, failing to assert an affirmative defense means it is waived. The Court has no ground as a result to dismiss a cause of action for being insufficiently alleged on its face, and/or that the defendants had waived the defense and admitted the truth of the accusation.

As such, in this case, since, undisputedly, none of the fourteen Defendants have appeared *pro se* or by attorneys to allege that Plaintiff herein had failed to prove any injury of any kind, undisputedly, as a matter of law, their such affirmative defense could not be done on their behalf by the Court, which, undisputedly, as a matter of law, cannot be both judges and defense attorneys at law at the same time.

Viewing the foregoing, it is crystal clear that the Ohio District Courts and the USCA6 have acted wrongfully and illegally based on their own MAGA conservative misogynist biases and/or prejudices to dismiss on behalf of the Respondents herein Petitioner's otherwise undisputedly meritorious complaint. The Lower Courts patently share the same unconstitutional misogynist and racist legal philosophy of the Respondents herein.

Second Issue:

Respondents argue that Petitioner's claim that Defendants' anti-abortion legislation is in violation of the U.S. Constitution and 1973 Roe v. Wade is meritless and futile as a matter of law because of SCOTUS's 2022 ruling in Dobbs.

Argument and Authorities: Now this is exactly the bottom line of the Ohio District Court and the USCA6's orders [A: 1-10,] which dismiss Petitioner's complaint. It shows the weaknesses or rather the complete failure by the lower courts to argue as a matter of law to defend the unjustifiable unconstitutionality and/or patent illegality of the self-styled Ohio's Human Rights and Heartbeat Protection Act (HRHPA). It further explains why the courts below resort to procedural technicalities regarding "standing," or standard required to file an In Forma Paureris Application, to defeat Petitioner's complaint, which is patently correct,

constitutional, and legal, while the HRHPA is incorrect, unconstitutional, illegal, and must be annulled and voided.

As such, the foregoing issue certainly needs an exhaustive clarification by Petitioner herein to convince this USSC that overall the lower courts' dismissal order(s) being appealed **[A: 1-10]** are only a skillful but invalid way for the courts to kick the can down the road, and, after all, Petitioner herein must undisputedly show not only my standing but also good legal substantive grounds before being able to ask this U.S. Supreme Court to reverse the dismissal orders being appealed, and decide the issues on the merits in the favor and vital interests of millions of American CBA women and their loved ones in Ohio, Oklahoma, Texas and all America, of which great mass of people, Petitioner herein is only an insignificant member.

4. Do you think the Ohio District Court and USCA6 applied the wrong law? If so, what law do you want SCOTUS to apply?

The Southern District Court of Ohio, Western Division, and the USCA6 have failed to reject SCOTUS June 24, 2022 *Dobbs* ruling, which allows some States like Ohio to issue unconstitutional misogynist legislation, which is patently the wrong law. Petitioner needs this Highest Court of the land to return to 1973 *Roe v. Wade.*

Dobbs is the wrong law to apply to the instant proceeding because it is not a controlling federal law but only a decision by SCOTUS in one specific case, to wit: *Dobbs v. Jackson.* There can be neither *res judicata* theory nor collateral estoppel doctrine to apply *Dobbs* ruling to the instant civil case entitled *MacTruong v. Mike DeWine, et al.* Neither the parties nor the issues being raised are the same.

As reported by the New York Times, during his September 9 2022 interview with two Judges of the USCA10, U.S. Chief Justice John Roberts defended SCOTUS's main role of interpreting the U.S. Constitution over Congress and the Government. Justice Roberts is quite correct on this important point. However, the six U.S. Justices, are sued in this action, not because they did their honest job of interpreting in good faith, honesty, reason, and intelligence U.S. Constitution, but

on the contrary, they have betrayed the straightforward trusting American people by writing literally a legal piece of irrational findings of fact and inconsistent controlling legal authorities not to uphold but destroy the U.S. Constitution to meet their unconstitutional conservative **misogynist** agenda that has been planned and supported by legally-uneducated hardcore shameless liar twice impeached and twice criminally indicted former President Donald J. Trump, another conservative misogynist Defendant-Respondent herein, who has shamelessly bragged that he had singlehandedly destroyed *Roe v. Wade* by having conspired to appoint three of his co-conspirators to be associate justices of current SCOTUS conservative majority. **[A: 41-44 and 57]**

As such, the main point of this civil action is to unmask the conspiracy of all the defendants-respondents herein and **lawfully** remove them from SCOTUS to save and restore the integrity and capital role of one of the three most important institutions of our valuable historic American democracy, which must remain the greatest in human history and hopefully lead all humankind to the next level of interplanetary civilization in a brand-new era.

The precise foundation of the Respondents' extremely difficult-to-prove-beyond-a-reasonable-doubt cheating scheme in the history-changing matter of *Dobbs* is Respondent **Alito's calculated absurd illogical false finding that even though the U.S. Constitution protects all U.S. citizens' rights to life, liberty, property, privacy, and the pursuit of happiness, it does not protect CBA women's natural inalienable right to have sex for pleasure, happiness, reproduction, or, if need be, safely induced miscarriages.**

The task of proving that Appellee-Respondent Alito's legally uneducated, unconstitutional, and illegal finding to cheat America must be rejected by this USSC is indeed very difficult to do beyond a reasonable doubt. Such a job, however, is not impossible. **It can be done rationally and scientifically beyond a reasonable doubt if Petitioner herein is granted an opportunity to express myself properly and base my demonstration on a much higher and correct method of reasoning than the Aristotelian non-contradictory logical system, the whole Western educated modern world has been taught so far in colleges and law schools.**

Since in this civil proceeding, Petitioner's credibility will certainly be seriously questioned or strongly scrutinized by many concerned parties or scholars and experts of all kinds, whose opinions on the issues being raised herein will be radically opposite to mine, may it please the Court

to allow Petitioner herein to introduce myself first with some necessary detailed educational background as follows.

Petitioner *pro se* Dmt MacTruong is over 79 years of age. I am a philosopher with my own original philosophy entitled Absolute Relativity, meaning absolutely everything, including truth, falsehood, existence, inexistence, life, death, the universe, absolute, relativity, God, heaven, hell, good, evil, Aristotelian principle of non-contradiction, and motion of non-null masses, is relative, hence a contradiction in term, which is however not absolutely but only relatively untrue, i.e., relatively true. "Absolute Relativity" is the title and sole topic of the 414-page thesis written in French for Petitioner's 1972 Ph.D. diploma in Philosophy at the Faculty of Letters and Human Sciences, Paris-Sorbonne-Pantheon University, France. **[See, A: 18, 58, 60]** I am indeed very proud of the Sorbonne because this oldest renowned European university is directly descending from Plato's Academy and Aristotle's Lyceum. Had I not read firsthand Aristotle's Organon, and Einstein's Relativity theory, among other most known books, then I would not have written my theory of Absolute Relativity the way it was. **[A: 58 & 60]**

Sorbonne Professor of Philosophy Pierre Aubenque, who sponsored my doctoral thesis admiringly said that Absolute Relativity is the ultimate goal of traditional philosophy to discover absolute truth in the zodiac from Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, to Descartes, Kant, Hegel, Karl Marx, and Einstein. Finally, your Petitioner Dmt MacTruong herein discovered and built on it (Absolute Relativity) an indisputable system of reasoning, which no one who is educated and rational can argue against, to teach all humankind how to think, speak, and act properly and appropriately to start a new era, the Absolute Relativity Era, based on a new revolutionary way of reasoning, communicating and acting together so that the educated portion of humanity could progress in freedom and creativity without violence or cheating that may continue to be practiced by under-educated and irrational people like the Respondents herein and their followers.

However, since the length of the instant Petition is limited by Court's rules, may it please the Court to refer to **Petitioner's Appendix Pages 25-28, 29-31, 32-40, 45-50, 51-53, 54, 55, 56, 59, and 60** for some more details regarding Petitioner's reliable personal and educational background.

5. Did the Ohio District Court & USCA6 incorrectly decide the facts? If so, what facts?

Ohio's Human Rights and Heartbeat Protection Act (HRHPA) is patently misogynist unconstitutional and an admitted direct violation of *Roe v. Wade.* The lower courts impliedly acknowledge it when they denied based on lack of standing, hence not on the merits, Petitioner's request for relief striking down Respondents' anti-abortion legislation and of course holding all Respondents herein accountable for their respective criminal roles when they have acted in concert with one another literally lying to achieve their conservative misogynist agenda by reversing 1973 *Roe* and adopting on June 24, 2022, the new *Dobbs* ruling, in which SCOTUS Majority **maliciously** and **falsely** proclaims in substance that nowhere in the U.S. Constitution can one say that it supports an abortion right, as clearly as the right to bear arms for example, and as such the abortion issue is not a federal one but should be returned to the States and their people to formulate their respective low-standard rational legislation.

***Dobbs* ruling is against common sense, illegal, unconstitutional and can be proven to be so beyond a reasonable doubt as follows.** A woman's right to make a final decision to remove a blood clot, which Respondents herein may call a sacred gift of God, or an unborn human being in her uterus, is not at all a moral issue or a matter of political opinion as Respondent Alito has maliciously and incorrectly stated. Depriving a CBA woman of such right to life, liberty, property, privacy, and pursuit of happiness, is as illegal and unconstitutional as murder, rape, physical assault, libel, bullying, misogyny, or slavery is. The true issue is not as Respondents herein have presented to cheat the American people or Ohioan, Oklahoman, Floridian, or Texan citizens. It is not whether the American legislator should be pro-life or pro-choice. Ideally, the law should be of course pro-life, since undisputedly a modern community of human beings living under the rule of law is primarily composed of living, not dead, people with all that may mean or imply. Obviously, we must be pro-life as much as we can, and not be pro-death as we live.

However, U.S. law should also be pro-choice since **there is no real or meaningful life without freedom of choice.** To live is to choose. Only dead people do not make choices or need freedom. The American legislator must respect the U.S. Constitution that guarantees the most basic rights of a person male or female, black or white, to enjoy life, liberty, property, privacy, and pursuit of happiness, which fundamental

inalienable rights naturally include our right to make our own decisions concerning the way we live and take care of our own bodies, which undisputedly include our need for sex and to reproduce the way we want it at the time, in the manner, and with whom we want, with or without protection in spite of any risk of becoming pregnant. As mature human beings, none of us would prefer to trust retarded, criminal, insufficiently educated misogynist people such as the Respondents herein to make so many and constant necessary routine personal intimate daily life decisions for us, the same way as when, where, and how to breathe, eat, drink, sleep, urinate, or have sex. On the contrary, unlike the weirdest, nonsensical, and criminal Respondents herein, the wise authors of the U.S. Constitution, makers of the 1866 and 1964 Civil Rights Acts and the 1973 *Roe v. Wade,* understood this inalienable natural right and need to have sex, and included it as being among our rights to life, liberty, property, privacy, and pursuit of happiness. As such, under the U.S. Constitution, *WE THE PEOPLE* are free to make our own decisions of preserving or removing any tiny blood clot that eventually appears in the uterus of a CBA woman after she had unprotected sex with a fertile male. By the same token, the U.S. Constitution that protects the woman's right to life does not allow anybody to put her life recklessly in danger by depriving her, under color of law, of her right to liberty to choose a safely induced miscarriage by professionals when she decides it is what she needs to be alive, free, and happy. The U.S. Constitution that protects the woman's right to property does not allow anybody to use her vagina or uterus to serve, for instance, her State or rapists, like the monstrous criminal Respondents herein, instead of for her own sake and in her most intimate personal interest. The U.S. Constitution that protects the woman's right to privacy does not allow anybody, including of course Respondents herein, to force her to open wide her vagina or uterus to show to them or the public whether she is pregnant or not or what she can or not do with blood clots that she may have in her uterus a few weeks after she had sex without protection with a fertile man. Obviously, that is her own most private personal business and none of anybody else. The U.S. Constitution that protects the woman's right to the pursuit of happiness does not allow anybody to take away her freedom to choose what to do to deal with blood clots that may appear inside her womb a few weeks after she had sex without protection with a fertile man. Obviously, all her constitutional rights to life, liberty, property, privacy, and the pursuit of happiness would be unacceptably abridged if strangers like the crooked but clever reactionary racist misogynist Respondents herein are allowed to gang up to create so-called pro-life legislation to prohibit a raped CBA woman as young as 10 years of age from removing any of the hereinabove mentioned blood clots, even if that's what she and her loved ones would deem desirable or necessary.

Petitioner herein together with almost 80% of all the American mature and balanced intelligent people believe that the reasoning of the majority of SCOTUS Justices in *Roe v. Wade,* protecting the right of the

woman to decide whether she wants in her own selfish or unselfish interest to keep or remove a fetus inside her womb before the latter is viable outside her body, is appropriate, correct, balanced, and should continue to be the law of this land of the free and the brave.

6. Did the Ohio District Court and the USCA6 fail to consider important grounds for relief? If so, what grounds?

ROE V. WADE HAS NOT BEEN ANNULLED OR VOIDED BECAUSE OF THE JUNE 24 2022 *DOBBS* RULING

1. Even though Petitioner herein had sued Respondents herein prior to the June 24 2022 adoption of *Dobbs*, I am quite aware of this ruling. Respondent Alito's *Dobbs* erroneously found in substance that nothing is clearly said or even implied in the U.S. Constitution that women have the right to abort. As such, it is not a federally protected right and it would be up to each State of the Union to make its own legislation on this matter.

2. Such a finding by Respondents Alito *et al.* is a willful and calculated material misstatement of fact and/or law to overturn *Roe v. Wade* to satisfy some radical immature misogynist reactionary conservative members of GOP. These Respondents may and should be prosecuted for betraying the U.S. Constitution by intentionally misreading it. And even if they may avoid prosecution and punishment because of their judicial immunity status as SCOTUS Justices, their finding to turn over *Roe* but support *Dobbs,* which is RATIONALLY contrary to the U.S. Constitution, is and must be declared null and void by any federal court, including this USSC of course, which has a sound and correct understanding of the post-Civil War U.S. Constitution, especially the 13th and 14th Amendments.

3. **In any event, the recent June 24 2022 SCOTUS *Dobbs* decision has not changed anything to the merits of Petitioner's instant civil action against the unconstitutionality and illegality of Respondents' anti-abortion legislation.**

4. Indeed, *Dobbs* is outright incorrect and ludicrous. It would be the same for the Court to refuse to strike down a State law that outlaws same-sex marriage or punishes a black woman for sitting in front of a bus next to a white man or issue a ticket to a black man who enters a public toilet that is reserved for white people only. Undisputedly, *Dobbs* ruling would **not** allow a racist State, for the purpose of creating certain zones where white people only can reside, to make a law prohibiting for instance black people from urinating even in their homes in those areas. Indeed, when being attacked for their unconstitutionality, such racially discriminatory laws **cannot** be defended by *Dobbs* ruling on the exact same ludicrous Alito finding: Nowhere in the U.S.

Constitution is it said that black men have the right to pee wherever they live and as such it would be up to each State to regulate the issue.

5. The right to urinate or to have sex is the same as the right to breathe or eat or drink. When the U.S. Constitution provides all citizens, black or white, male or female, with their right to life, liberty, property, privacy, and the pursuit of happiness, it implies their right to have sex and control their sex life, with all the consequences such as pregnancies or childbirths to be terminated or continued, the same way as when a Court issues an order granting an ex-husband the right to remove all his furniture from the former marital residence, it means all furniture including his tables and chairs for instance. A local sheriff may not stop him from taking his tables and chairs falsely pretending that the order indeed mentions "furniture" but does not specifically mention tables and chairs by name. It's an incorrect, bad-faith, and invalid interpretation of the order.

6. That basic natural right of men, and women of course, to have sex for pleasure or procreate does not even need to be written in black and white to be protected by any written constitution or statute that makes sense or is read in good faith. It is life itself and born with a human being, white or black, male or female, starting immediately at birth. So, regulating a woman's sexual activities is controlling her life in the most intimate vital private personal details possible. She can be literally choked to death in the same way as Floyd had been deprived of his right to breathe by Chauvin. Even shameless and heartless white radical supremacist racist misogynist Respondents Alito, Barrett, Gorsuch, Kavanaugh, and Thomas may not argue with reason to defend Chauvin against Floyd murder charge that nowhere is it written in the U.S. Constitution that a black man has the same right to breathe as a white one.

7. As such, with or without the U.S. Constitution, women have the right to breathe, urinate, and have sex, and no State would have the power to murder them by unconstitutionally regulating these <u>fundamental natural inalienable rights</u> beyond what would be absolutely rational to protect other citizens' basic rights to enjoy same.

8. As such, States may not unreasonably interfere with, limit, chip away, or abridge any of those most inherent natural **<u>inalienable</u>** rights, be their protection literally written or not in black and white in the U.S. Constitution, which, of course just unambiguously does, when it conspicuously mentions the right of all citizens to life, liberty, property, privacy, and pursuit of happiness. **<u>It is rather true, in this particular situation, that the contrary finding that what is not prohibited is allowed and protected</u>. It is rather the basic way to write a constitution or statute in a free country. As such, since it is not prohibited by the U.S. Constitution, which conspicuously protects our inalienable rights to life, liberty, property,**

privacy, and pursuit of happiness, the right to have a safely induced miscarriage is provided, and which right may not be irrationally abridged by any State of the Union.

9. **Viewing the foregoing, American legislators should and must be both pro-life and pro-choice.** These two rights are not exclusive but complementary to each other. **We cannot be pro-life without being pro-choice. We cannot be pro-choice without being pro-life.** None would be valid to the detriment of the other. They both must be balanced and taken into careful consideration at the same time for a peaceful and civilized human community to function, develop and succeed. As such only if the U.S. is a savage barbarian uncivilized country under the criminal traitor and hardcore liar Respondent misogynist Trump, WE THE PEOPLE may not interfere with or abridge women's inalienable right to have at their free option safely induced miscarriages prior to the viability of their fetuses.

10. Any moral value that a liberal democracy wants CBA women to adopt and follow against their free will can only be done by an intelligent, rational, and balanced educational system but not by imprisonment, a heavy fine, or murder under the color of law.

11. As such, as Respondent SCOTUS Justice Alito said, correctly this time, out loud and clear, *Dobbs* was only an opinion, which was worth whatever it may be worth. And, from many points of view, *Dobbs* is indeed worth nothing, being a very bad-faith, radical, and unbalanced misogynist opinion trying to resolve a very complex double intertwined issue from only one simplistic view of what life is or when it starts.

12. It is, consequently, important to note that, in Respondent Alito's own words, *Dobbs* is not at all an indication that States may now ban abortion in any way they may deem rational. And unconditional protection of the voiceless unborn from gestation is not rational enough to ban all abortion.

13. As such, *Dobbs* is not a controlling legal authority, at least in the case at bar, because the *Dobbs* SCOTUS did not address the specific issues being raised in this case of whether Ohio Respondents' HRHPA should be annulled and voided for violating women's constitutional rights to life, liberty, property, privacy, and the pursuit of happiness, the 13th and 14th Amendments, the 1866 and 1964 Civil Rights Acts, SCOTUS 1973 *Roe v. Wade* ruling, and/or MacTruong's copyrighted intellectual property entitled the CCO Network. [A: 11-14]

14. In substance, since, any American legislator, both State and federal, must respect our Constitution that guarantees the most basic inalienable right of a citizen to life, liberty, property, privacy, and the pursuit of happiness, which undisputedly include above all their right to make their own decisions concerning the survival and maintenance of their own bodies and how to satisfy their natural need for sex, whether to procreate or for pure mental or physical satisfaction, whether to have it with or without protection. Such right

to have free choice to have sex includes one to preserve or remove any blood clot, which eventually appears in the uterus of a CBA woman a few weeks after she had unprotected sex with a fertile male. Any law banning abortion prior to the fetus's viability outside the woman's womb, as determined by *Roe* is undisputedly unconstitutional. It undisputedly interferes with and unacceptably violates both women's and men's fundamental natural right to have sex for pleasure to enjoy themselves physically and mentally, and pursue their happiness, rights being protected literally by the U.S. Constitution in its totality, and specifically by its First, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Ninth, Tenth and especially the 13th and 14th Amendments, the 1866 and 1964 Civil Rights Acts, and SCOTUS's 1973 *Roe v. Wade* ruling.

15. **The June 24 2022 *Dobbs* ruling by SCOTUS has nothing to do with the January 12 1973 *Roe v. Wade* ruling in the case at bar. As a matter of law, the former cannot and has not overturned the latter in spite of Respondents' contrary *dicta* in this matter.**

16. **Rationally, since, like any right, the constitutional right to abort cannot be absolute, it must be limited to some time after the pregnancy has commenced. *Roe* has wisely limited the cut-off date of such right to abort at the fetus's viability outside the womb, meaning the fetus can be an unborn child capable of living without depending any further on its pregnant mother, who has no more an arbitrary right to end its life, since she has the option of letting it live either inside or outside her body. As such, by the same token, the right to ban abortion by any State legislature should also be limited at the cut-off date of the fetus's viability and not prior.**

17. Indeed, as long as the physical survival of the fetus depends on that of its mother, she is the natural and constitutional ultimate decision-maker in this matter, far more reliable and better than any nosy neighbors, such as the fantastic, nosy, brainless, and heartless Defendants herein and their subordinates, who, unless they egregiously violate the right to privacy of the woman, do not, in any event, have any relevant information in the circumstances to make fair just informed appropriate decisions.

18. **The true issue, in the case at bar, is who has the right to decide what to do with blood clot(s) inside the womb of a woman,** she or her brainless and heartless neighbors, Defendants herein, who are strangers to her in the instant proceeding, but clever politicians enough to act in concert under color of State misogynist statutes to violate women's constitutional rights to life, liberty, property, privacy, and pursuit of happiness? The answer should be undisputedly the same as to the question, who should have the power to decide for a pregnant woman who does not want to abort even after having been gang-raped by a group of criminal rapists carrying HIV or lethal venereal diseases? The answer, by common sense, the U.S. Constitution, and almost 80% of the mature intelligent American people, is the woman in person. Since

nobody can force her to abort, then nobody can stop her from deciding to remove any blood clot that appears to be undesirable in her personal judgment, whether it is in her uterus or anywhere else in her body. Those neighbors like the legally uneducated, hypocritical, and mentally immature misogynist defendants herein may try to widen their view to see that since nobody would force them, their dear loving mothers, wives, or daughters to keep unwanted blood clots in their uteruses or wombs, they should not try to violate the U.S. Constitution, the 1866 and 1964 Civil Rights Acts, the Roe v. Wade ruling and destroy under the color of State law other people's lives and/or peace of mind by making unconstitutional laws preventing their free citizen neighbors from enjoying sex and living their private lives in dignity, peace and happiness.

7. Do you feel that there are any other reasons why the USCA6's Dismissal Order was wrong? If so, what?

REASONS WHY DEFENDANTS ALITO *ET AL.* MUST BE FOUND GUILTY OF CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT MASS MURDER IN VIOLATION OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION

19. It sounds incredible, but with full and rational explanation, based on reliable historic and current facts, known to the American public, this Court will discover that **Respondents Trump, Thomas, and Alito *et al.* must be found guilty of conspiracy to commit mass murder of CBA women in violation of the U.S. Constitution, no less than Hitler and Himmler should have been found guilty of having planned and actually mass-murdered 6 million Jews during World War II. These two of the most mass-murderous criminals of war could have and did justify their horrendous holocaust by telling their Nazi followers and/or the world that what they did was a necessary service to all humankind. They eliminated a group of people who also believe in murder like the Jewish God 1.0, who ordered the sacrifice of a faithful Jew's first-born son to show respect to Him, until Abraham cleverly substituted the latter with a delicious grilled lamb for all to relax and enjoy.**

20. In *Dobbs* 100-page apparently intentionally leaked drafted decision by him, Defendant Samuel Alito asked readers in substance: If we can ban post-viability abortion, then why can we not ban pre-viability abortion? A life is a life, whether it is viable inside or outside the womb. As such, to protect life, we should be even more diligent and wiser to do so as soon as we can determine that a gift of God Almighty deserves to be granted personhood wonderfully starting at the beginning of the gestation. As such, conservative misogynist

Respondent Alito observes that the authors of *Roe* were idiotic and irrational or lacked diligence not to commence the protection of life right on the first day it gloriously appears. He wondered out loud for the whole of America to hear: Why should we have to be stupid idiot helpless protectors of a pre-viability unborn child while we can certainly assume that LIFE is equally precious for a pre- or post-viability human being?

21. Now why, by so wondering out loud, are Alito *et al.*, but not the authors of *Roe*, not only idiotic, for not knowing the obvious, but also committing mass-murders and should be prosecuted for capital crimes and felonies like Hitler and Himmler should have been for having massacred 6 million Jews during WW II? *[**Note:** Like Defendants herein, Hitler never bluntly explained to non-Nazi people that he ordered all Jews to be massacred because they did not have any right to life, liberty, property, privacy, and pursuit of happiness, as written in the naïve and silly American Constitution.]*

22. Respondent Alito is wrong on this point because **the material difference between a pre-viability unborn and a post-viability one is <u>not</u> a physiological or medical or scientific but a <u>legal</u> issue.** It makes sense for the *Roe* authors to decide that the pregnant woman's constitutional rights to life, liberty, property, privacy, and pursuit of happiness, including self-defense, freedom of religion, speech, learning, traveling, sport, entertainment, and so on, should start, not stop, from gestation and last so long as the unborn depends on her to grow and live. **<u>But such constitutional rights of the mother over the unborn will end when the latter can live outside her womb.</u>** And, as such the mother's power of life and death over her unborn baby should stop and yield before that of her State, which can, if it so volunteers, from this point on, make a choice on what to do in the best interest of the pregnant female citizen's unborn child so long as its viability does not depend on her anymore but on the medical personnel of her State and its hopefully competent social workforce.

23. **As such, a State's power to issue post-viability anti-abortion law is rational and constitutional.** However, a State's power to issue pre-viability anti-abortion law is irrational and would squarely and undisputedly violate all the pregnant woman's afore-said constitutionally-protected inalienable natural rights, which a U.S. citizen is born with, and guaranteed by the 13th and 14th Amendments that have been obtained literally over the torn-up bloody dead bodies of more than 600,000 brave Americans including that of President Lincoln. Defendants herein may be quick to forget that greatest American unforgettable historic event because they probably are descendants or sympathizers of the losers of the Civil War or Hitler's Nazism, but the rest of us should rather not. It should even be our duty to remind all our fellow Americans of our days, that **evolution to a better, fairer, and more just community may have high costs to pay and cannot be**

all the time taken for granted or cheated away. George Washington once said: ***"Government is not reason; it is not eloquence; it is force! Like fire, it is a dangerous servant and a fearful master."***

24. In other words, if properly asked, no modern woman in her mature right mind would say that she would not trust herself or her family or loved ones with her constitutional right to decide to abort or not when she is pregnant but would rather trust the brainless and heartless misogynist Respondents herein or their pro-Nazi followers to make it for her. These brainless nasty misogynist nosy people do exist. Some of them are even part of the federal court system, starting with SCOTUS Respondents herein. They are also literally the U.S. District Court, Southern District of Ohio, Western Division, and the USCA6, which issued the unconstitutional Dismissal Order(s) being appealed. In a way, they dreamingly believe that the people of the State of Ohio are a royal family with the Government the king. It would be "normal" that beautiful princesses should ask the permission of the king if they want to abort. However, Respondents herein disregard the fact that as a matter of law, they have no right to be kings in this land of the free and the brave. Constitutionally, America is a republic and democracy, women are not princesses. They are citizens with the same equal rights as all other citizens. They need no governmental authorities to tell them whether or when they can get a safely induced miscarriage. Abortion is a private, not a State business, a personal business, not that of the woman's neighbors.

25. Respondents Alito *et al.*'s unconstitutional and absurd *Dobbs* ruling shows that they are alien to the true American spirit of freedom and equality, which is embodied in the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution. Defendants as such are literally felons and murderers when they calculatedly violate women's most fundamental inalienable rights to own and control their vaginas and uteruses. They may and should be prosecuted for sexual harassment, sexual abuse, mass murder, and criminal reckless endangerment because they allow pre-viability anti-abortion laws, which will be the cause of death of any pregnant woman who dies because she would have been prohibited by her State law to obtain a safely induced miscarriage when she urgently wants it.

26. There is no need to wait until those deaths have indeed occurred in countless numbers and duly recorded with undisputed documentary evidence admissible in a court of law to prosecute Defendants herein for murders. Indeed, only brainless and heartless criminals like them would argue in ludicrous bad faith that the deaths won't happen or that it won't be their fault or responsibility if those women die. They deserve to die after having intentionally violated the law, Defendants' criminal, and unconstitutional anti-abortion laws of course, which according to their ludicrous misleading propaganda are the noblest and life-saving legislation being issued from the beginning to the end of time.

A CAREFUL READING OF THE CONSTITUTION WITHIN ITS APPROPRIATE HISTORICAL CONTEXT SHOWS WHY AS A MATTER OF LAW AND DUE PROCESS *DOBBS* RULING HAS NO LEGAL AUTHORITY TO OVERTURN *ROE V. WADE.*

27. Undisputedly Defendants-Respondents SCOTUS members Alito, Thomas, Gorsuch, Kavanaugh, Barrett, and Chief Justice Roberts are traitors and cheaters and, probably unknowingly to them, mass sex abusers and murderers. They are proven traitors to the U.S. Constitution that embodies these lofty and proud ideals of Democracy, Equality, Freedom, Ownership, Privacy, and the Pursuit of Happiness for all, not for a few shameless or clever slave owners, misogynists, hypocrites, criminals, frauds, liars, and cheaters like them.

28. Indeed, the foregoing fundamental inalienable constitutional rights of white male U.S. citizens to own and control our own lives and bodies to freely do our own things in private, and pursue our own happiness, as long as we would not bother anyone else, had been won on behalf of black and female citizens as well, not only by love and a sense of justice and fairness but also by true physical violent death and awful bloodbaths of more than 600,000 courageous American Civil-War soldiers of all colors on both sides, including the bravest and most honorable President Abraham Lincoln himself. This fundamental right has literally been written in black and white in the U.S. Constitution by the end of the Civil War, when in creating the Civil Rights Act of 1866, Congress had used the authority given it to enforce the newly ratified 13th Amendment, abolishing slavery and protecting the rights of Black Americans.

29. Southern Vice President Andrew Johnson, who became President after the assassination of President Lincoln by a Southerner, like many of the bad-faith and cheating Respondents herein, vetoed the bill. Luckily for those who love freedom, justice, and equality for all, then Congress successfully overrode Johnson's veto and made it into law in April 1866 and called it the Civil Rights Act of 1866, which is the valid law enforceable even right now to evidence that *Dobbs* is squarely illegal, and SCOTUS Respondents in this matter, who adopted it, are literally criminals and traitors and should be indicted and prosecuted for treason by the U.S. DOJ, like criminal traitor respondent Trump herein now is. Undisputedly, they have conspired with one another under the clever MAGA slogan by Defendant Trump and a few innocent idealistic but misinformed so-called pro-life college girls to try to turn America back to pre-Civil War misogynist moral, social, cultural, and legal values.

30. The opening sentence of Section One of the 14th Amendment defined U.S. citizenship as follows: ***"All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of***

the United States and of the State wherein they reside." This clearly repudiated the Supreme Court's pre-Civil War notorious 1857 *Dred Scott* decision, in which reactionary **Chief Justice Roger Taney incorrectly and maliciously wrote that a Black man, even if born free, could not claim rights of citizenship under the federal constitution.**

31. Section One's second clause of the 14th Amendment was: ***"No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States."*** This greatly expanded the civil and legal rights of all American citizens by protecting them from infringement by the States as well as by the federal government.

32. The third clause, ***"nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty or property, without due process of law,"*** expanded the due process clause of the Fifth Amendment to apply to the States as well as the federal government. Over time, the U.S. Supreme Court, which is now manned by a majority of shameless impostors, misogynists, and liars that are the named Defendants Associates Justices herein, has interpreted this clause to guarantee a wide array of rights against infringement by the States, including those enumerated in the Bill of Rights (freedom of speech, free exercise of religion, right to bear arms, and so on,) as well as the right to privacy and other fundamental rights not specifically mentioned elsewhere in the Constitution.

33. Finally, the "due process" or "equal protection clause" ***("nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws")*** **was clearly intended to stop State governments from discriminating against Black Americans and of course, WOMEN, and over the years would play a key role in many landmark civil rights cases.**

34. After beloved President Lincoln was assassinated in April 1865, his successor, President Andrew Johnson, a **Democrat and former slaveowner from Tennessee, supported emancipation, but differed greatly from the then Republican-controlled Congress** in his view on how Reconstruction should proceed. With Johnson's complicity, the newly elected Southern State legislatures (largely dominated by former Confederate leaders) enacted **Black Codes**, which were repressive and strictly regulated the behavior of Black citizens and effectively kept them dependent on white planters. The **Black Codes** criminalize activities that would make it easy to imprison African Americans, and **effectively force them into servitude once more.**

35. In ***Plessy v. Ferguson*** **(1896),** the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that racially segregated public facilities did not violate the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment, a decision that would help establish **infamous Jim Crow segregationist laws** throughout the South for decades to come.

36. But beginning in the 1920s, the Supreme Court increasingly applied the protections of the 14th Amendment on the State and local level. In its famous 1954 ruling in ***Brown v. Board of Education,*** the Supreme Court overturned the "separate but equal" doctrine established in *Plessy v. Ferguson*, ruling that segregated public schools did in fact violate the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment.

37. Undisputedly, following this trend of protecting equal rights to both black and women, in 1973 this Supreme Court resolved the issue of abortion by issuing its fair and just ruling in *Roe v. Wade.*

38. Also undisputedly, Respondents herein being attached to their conservative misogynist tradition are now trying to return America to pre-Civil War conditions and values, i.e., they are trying to lead our great country backward from the progress WE THE PEOPLE have accomplished since the mid of the 19th Century with streams of blood and hills of bones of more than 600,000 dead bodies on the battlefields.

DOBBS COURT HAS INTENTIONALLY READ OUT OF HISTORICAL CONTEXT THE WRITTEN WORDS OF THE 13th and 14th AMENDMENTS TO MALICIOUSLY AND CRIMINALLY ABOLISH WOMEN'S SACRED RIGHT TO OWN AND CONTROL THEIR REPRODUCTIVE ORGANS AS LATER ASSERTED BY *ROE V. WADE.*

39. The treasons by Respondents Alito, Kavanaugh, Gorsuch and Barrett have been known on public records to all informed Americans, **[See, A: 41-42]** as noted and emphasized on TV by GOP U.S. Senator Susan Collins, **[See, A: 43-44]** to whom Respondents had promised in public and private hearings **not** to overturn *Roe v. Wade.*

40. This Court must have taken judicial notice that on May 17, 2023, Respondent Trump herein triumphantly and publicly bragged about his felony of acting in concert with Respondents Gorsuch, Kavanaugh, and Barrett to betray the U.S. Constitution and legally "kill" *Roe v. Wade*, and by the same token, what he did not say, physically murder countless CBA women in the future. **[A: 57]**

41. The treasons by Defendants Alito, Thomas and Chief Justice Roberts are no less formal and fully documented since they have been publicly and solemnly sworn in to uphold, not to intentionally misinterpret and rewrite, the Constitution. Interestingly, on October 24, 2022, the NY Times sent Petitioner herein in my personal email address its even-date article showing **in 2005 Respondent Alito assured late Senator Ted Kennedy that he would not betray *Roe*, in the event he would be nominated to SCOTUS. [See, A: 42]** Undisputedly, the NY Times, who must have been aware of this civil action in the lower courts, wanted

Petitioner herein to place on the records of this action in this Court that like Trump-appointed SCOTUS members Gosuch, Kavavaugh, and Barrett, Respondent Samuel Alito too was a traitor and liar, whose lies and treason were duly and publicly recorded regarding the issue of *Roe v. Wade.* **[See, A: 42]**

42. **Undisputedly, all five SCOTUS-member Respondents herein and Chief Justice Roberts have publicly committed perjury.** [A: 41-44] The issue is only how the American people can legally hold these traitors and liars accountable to preserve and defend the highest value and survival of the American liberty, republic, and democracy as a matter of principles and, in particular, life and happiness of millions of our beloved CBA women, who, Respondents herein have definitely forgotten or ignored, are undisputedly and literally the indispensable creators, mothers, caretakers, and first craziest adorers of all the young generations to come.

43. All America is aware of that. This Court has taken judicial notice thereof. However, it is also undisputed that nobody, except Petitioner herein, feels the concern, painful injury, has the knowledge and courage to take necessary legal actions to save our CBA women from the extreme life-threatening hardship that they have, are and will continue to endure because of anti-abortion State legislation such as the **Ohioan HRHPA, the Oklahoman SB 612, and the Texan THA.** This extreme hardship may be ultra difficult to overcome, because when Petitioner herein did follow my own individual conscience and speak up, I have been literally chastised and seriously menaced and threatened in writing by the respective MAGA conservative misogynist powerful U.S. District Courts of Texas, Florida, Oklahoma, Ohio, and Indiana allegedly for being frivolous, baseless, meritless, implausible, fanciful, malicious, delusional, fantastic, mentally unbalanced, sanctionable, lacking arguable basis in fact or in law, and nationally known for being a frivolous litigant, something that is actually and legally untrue, **and personally known to Justice Sonia Sotomayor of this Court to be so. [See, A: 21]**

44. For one sure thing, the foregoing reaction by Defendants-Appellees-Respondents and the concerned District Courts, and the U.S. Courts of Appeals for the 2nd, 3rd, 5th, 6th, and 10th Circuits, taking their sides **illegally** without even their appearances to file affirmative defenses with the courts, is undisputedly abusive, unjustified, and inappropriate. **[See, A: 21]** It is patently based on their biases and prejudices deriving from their cultural and religious radical conservative racist and misogynist background, which is undisputedly both unconstitutional and illegal.

45. **Indeed, the Fourteenth Amendment must have been read together with the Thirteenth** for readers to understand in the right context that the right to own and control our lives and bodies, with all its parts and functionalities, of course, is the most valued of all privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States that

no States could or should be allowed to make law under false pretenses to abridge or trivialize. It is from this most basic right that all the others would have derived and been protected by the Constitution. Patently, due to their prejudices and biases, Respondents herein and several federal courts have turned upside down the correct understanding of these constitutional rights to abridge or suppress them outright or discreetly.

46. Legally incompetent or cheating Alito and five other SCOTUS justices wrote and/or supported a 100-page drafted decision in *Dobbs* full of nonsenses and irrationalities to overtly or implicitly conclude that the right of a free woman to own and control her entire body does not include the one for her to decide what to do with an almost invisible blood clot that may appear in her uterus a few weeks after she had unprotected sex with a fertile man. Such conclusion is undisputedly a calculated lie made by SCOTUS Respondents to try to reach their conservative racist and misogynist goals of restoring women's pre-Civil War rights and status in accordance with Defendants-Respondents' backward reactionary MAGA white Christian political religious racist misogynistic view and belief.

47. Some Respondents' affirmative defense that they do not infringe women's constitutional right to abort, because they do **not** prohibit them from deciding to terminate their pregnancy. They **"only"** criminalize providers of abortion services, which they can detect with the assistance of private citizen detectives being organized and enrolled in Petitioner's CCO Networks. **[A: 11-14]** However, this ludicrous argument undisputedly proves that they are a group of coward criminals and liars acting secretly in concert and bad faith to use twisted legalese to oppress helpless women at a time they are the most vulnerable. Obviously, how can a 10-year-old girl that had been repeatedly raped and became pregnant do anything against powerful but shameless, heartless insufficiently educated SCOTUS misogynist members like Alito, *et al.,* to defend her constitutional right to have in all quiet privacy an affordable painless safely induced miscarriage, which may save her from being drastically traumatized for life or literally murdered under color of State law?

48. Undisputedly, Respondents' State anti-abortion statutes are like the 1865 Black Codes, which were unmasked and outlawed by the 1866 Civil Rights Act.

49. Notwithstanding, 2023 American CBA women do not need any brainless and heartless hypocritical scientifically illiterate demagogue politicians like the Respondents herein, both in and out of SCOTUS, to make decisions regarding when and/or which ones of the foreign objects inside their wombs have been recognized "personhood status," by which State in the Union, to avoid to reside in or start to move out from, and as such the concerned woman and/or her service providers would be committing homicide or murder or child endangerment felony, if they would have attempted to remove the unwanted suspicious blood clots from

her body. This is absolutely a dangerous, unsettling, and humiliating condition of life that no CBA women sitting in or out of SCOTUS now or in the future would like to live in.

50. A federal judge on July 11, 2022, blocked a 2021 Arizona law recognizing the personhood of a fetus from the moment of fertilization, siding with abortion providers who said the measure was too vague and exposed them to harsh unfair wrongful prosecution.

51. In this proceeding, Petitioner herein does not argue that State anti-abortion legislation must be stricken down because they are vague on this starting point of exactly when the personhood of a fetus should be recognized by State law. We undisputedly prove with scientific and rational written documentary evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that they are unconstitutional and federally illegal so long as they infringe a CBA woman's constitutional rights to life, liberty, property, privacy, and the pursuit of happiness, which rights, as were spelled out in details by *Roe,* imply necessarily her right to freely decide what to do with any part of her body that cannot survive outside her, and has started to disturb her mentally day and night since she was aware of its existence.

52. **In simple words, it can be said that the U.S. Constitution and/or *Roe v. Wade* correctly consider a pre-viability fetus a woman's nail, or hair or benign lump in her breast or a tumor in her brain.** As such, a State has no more right to tell a woman not to remove a blood clot in her uterus than not to cut her hair or nails or reduce her oversized breast or remove from her brain some benign or cancerous tumor. **[See, A: 22-24]**

53. **Viewing the foregoing, Defendants SCOTUS members Alito, Thomas, Gorsuch, Kavanaugh, and Barrett deserve the death penalty or at least to be disbenched from the U.S. Supreme Court for having heartlessly and brainlessly calculated to issue the criminal and unconstitutional *Dobbs* ruling that allows such State death-trapping laws to mentally and physically torture sometimes to death millions of our beloved innocent CBA women with their unconstitutional State irrational and radical misogynist anti-abortion legislation.**

54. Viewing the foregoing true dramas resulting from any anti-abortion legislation such as the Ohioan HRHPA, the Oklahoman SB 612, and the Texan THA, having been created by the Respondents herein, which violates both the U.S. Constitution and *Roe v. Wade*, it is undisputed that the lower courts' Dismissal Order(s) being appealed must be reversed by this USSC for being inhuman, irrational, and murderous, besides delusional, fantastic, unconstitutional, and illegal.

55. Finally, by casually treating the issue of abortion that involves literally the life, happiness, or death of hundreds of thousands or even millions of both CBA women and unborn babies as if it were only the trivial

issue of the amount of a traffic ticket, which can be left to States or even cities to decide and enforce, SCOTUS Respondents herein have irresponsibly abdicated from their main duty of upholding our Constitution and keeping an united and consistent coherent rational federal jurisprudence governing all of America, instead of State by State of the Union.

56. Under the (illegal) control of Respondents Associate Justices herein, current SCOTUS has as such created an extremely dangerous national condition very similar to the one that preceded the American deadly 1861-1865 Civil War, when the South was for slavery while the North against it. Then SCOTUS never declared that President Lincoln was wrong and had acted unconstitutionally when he led the armed forces of the North to defeat those of the South to abolish slavery, because the U.S. Constitution had never written in black and white that black people had the same right to live free and are equal to the white ones. Literally, the forces of justice, fairness, equality, and liberty being led by history-making President Abraham Lincoln had courageously acted first with guns and swords, death, and bloodshed, then they wrote the 13th and 14th Amendments and the 1866 Civil Rights Act after. The rest can be correctly said to be the greatest new page of the most heroic democracy in the history of not only America but the entire world from the beginning of time.

57. **In any event, fact is, during the Civil War, many citizens of New York and New Jersey did bear arms and go to the South to kill or be killed in Texas, Alabama, or Oklahoma. None would argue with the military federal recruiters that they only have the duty to defend the States, of which they are citizens, but no other States of the Union. As such, it is ludicrous, incorrect, shameful, and outright illegal, unconstitutional, and un-American for a federal judge to dictate from the bench to dismiss Petitioner's complaint, which Respondents never opposed, by contending and holding that Petitioner herein, being a citizen of New Jersey, and no matter how patriotic I might be or claim to be, has no legitimate legal or constitutional interest or standing to be worried, sleepless, touched, and deeply concerned about Ohioan, Oklahoman, or Texan misogynist and murderous anti-abortion legislation that may cause the second American Civil War, in which I and/or my son or daughter or grandchildren will have the legal duty to bear arms to go, wherever the U.S. government would decide, to kill or be killed.**

58. The foregoing is the most vivid physical historical moral logical philosophical legal and constitutional REALITY of the U.S.A. **as one single unit of a brave and free human collective brain,** of which each individual American citizen is a vivid living partner.

59. Therefore, it is completely incorrect for any U.S. federal judge to dare write that a NJ citizen has no business or imminent injury to worry about the lives and welfare of millions of CBA women, being targets of powerful misogynist heartless groups of felons, who are discreetly murdering them by making laws and/or court orders depriving them of their human right to healthcare to have access to safely induced miscarriage procedures, be that by appropriate FDA approved drugs, or licensed surgeons at the place and time of their choice.

60. The June 24 2022 SCOTUS *Dobbs* ruling is so divisive for America that Respondents Alito, *et al.,* have set our beloved and dear people on the brink of a second Civil War for the pro-choice, i.e., pro-liberty States to fight the misogynist anti-freedom ones to liberate all American women, instead of the black slaves as during the first by the great heroic President Abraham Lincoln upholding the U.S. Constitution at any cost including more than 600,000 patriotic American lives and his own.

61. **However, as a matter of law, no violence is necessary to overturn *Dobbs*.** The American people do not need to take any violent action like desperate loser coward Defendant-Respondent Trump herein on January 6, 2021, to try to overturn by armed forces the result of the November 2020 Presidential Election.

62. **It is of note that this one of Defendant-Respondent Trump's most clearcut unconstitutional, illegal, criminal, anti-democratic, and anti-American felonies must be dealt with appropriately by the U.S. DOJ.** Also, this civil action is undisputedly further evidence of Trump's overall criminal misconduct against America. Petitioner herein, who voted for Trump twice, is not systematically anti-Trump, but only when he violates the undisputed principles and the true spirit of the U.S. Constitution and statutes. It was former President Trump's right to nominate SCOTUS justices, when occasions arrived, but it was a felony for him to appoint a candidate knowing that they would lie to the U.S. Senate that they would uphold *Roe* to have their nomination secured, then once this was done, they would treacherously go back on their promises. That is exactly what TREASON means in this constitutional context, and time for TRAITORS to be investigated, indicted, and held accountable to save the American Republic, Democracy, and Freedom.

63. America does not need to remove SCOTUS members defendants-Respondents herein from the Court by violence, because **WE ARE PROUDLY A NATION OF LAW. WE CAN WORK INTELLIGENTLY TOGETHER BASED ON LOVE, REASON, MODERATION, BALANCE, WISDOM, AND LEGALITY.**

64. And soon, **with AI (Artificial Intelligence) as our most advanced tool,** our nation will be able to effectively detect and nip in the bud to timely clean up all types of moral, religious, political, or legal corruption to date, not only in America but also all over the planet, then well beyond. **[See, A: 32-40]**

65. Indeed, this Court has full jurisdiction to do justice in this matter by taking into consideration the U.S. Constitution and all currently applicable federal statutes and pertinent case law in the matter including both *Roe* and *Dobbs* and resolve all the issues being raised in the instant action orderly and justly in the best interest of every particular U.S. citizen, as separate but interdependent individuals, and all the American people, as a leading partner of the unified peaceful harmonious happy creative joyful international community.

DEFENDANTS *ALITO ET AL.'S* OPINION HAS BEEN MOST STRONGLY REJECTED AND CONDEMNED TO BE DEADLY REACTIONARY AND MISOGYNIST BY JUSTICES BREYER, SOTOMAYOR, AND KAGAN.

66. In their *Dobbs* joint dissenting opinion dated June 24, 2022, Justices Breyer, Sotomayor and Kagan wrote:

> *"For half a century, Roe v. Wade, 410 U. S. 113 (1973), and Planned Parenthood of Southeastern Pa. v. Casey, 505 U. S. 833 (1992), have protected the liberty and equality of women. Roe held, and Casey reaffirmed, that* ***the Constitution safeguards a woman's right to decide for herself whether to bear a child. Roe held, and Casey reaffirmed, that in the first stages of pregnancy, the government could not make that choice for women. The government could not control a woman's body or the course of a woman's life: It could not determine what the woman's future would be.*** *See Casey, 505 U. S., at 853; Gonzales v. Carhart, 550 U. S. 124, 171–172 (2007) (Ginsburg, J., dissenting). Respecting a woman as an autonomous being, and granting her full equality, meant giving her substantial choice over this most personal and most consequential of all life decisions. Roe and Casey well understood the difficulty and divisiveness of the abortion issue. The Court knew that Americans hold profoundly different views about the "moral[ity]" of "terminating a pregnancy, even in its earliest stage." Casey, 505 U. S., at 850.* ***And the Court recognized that "the State has legitimate interests from the outset of the pregnancy in protecting" the "life of the fetus that may become a child."*** *Id., at 846.* ***So, the Court struck a balance, as it often does when values and goals compete. It held that the State could prohibit abortions after fetal viability, so long as the ban contained exceptions to safeguard a woman's life or health.*** *It held that even before viability, the State could regulate the abortion procedure in multiple and meaningful ways.* ***But until the viability line was crossed, the Court held, a State could not impose a "substantial obstacle" on a woman's "right to elect the procedure" as she (not the government) thought proper, in light of all the circumstances and complexities of her own life.*** *Ibid.*
>
> *Today, the Court discards that balance. It says that from the very moment of fertilization, a woman has no rights to speak of. A State can force her to bring a pregnancy to term, even at the steepest personal and familial costs. An abortion restriction, the majority holds, is permissible whenever rational, the lowest level of scrutiny known to the law. And because, as the Court has often stated, protecting fetal life is rational, States will feel free to enact all manner of restrictions. (...) Some States have enacted laws extending to all forms of abortion procedure, including taking medication in one's own home. They have passed laws without any exceptions for when the woman is the victim of rape or incest. (...) So too, after today's ruling, some States may compel women to carry to term a fetus with severe physical anomalies*

(...), sure to die within a few years of birth. (...) Across a vast array of circumstances, a State will be able to impose its moral choice on a woman and coerce her to give birth to a child.

Enforcement of all these draconian restrictions will also be left largely to the States' devices. A State can of course impose criminal penalties on abortion providers, including lengthy prison sentences. But some States will not stop there. Perhaps, in the wake of today's decision, a state law will criminalize the woman's conduct too, incarcerating or fining her for daring to seek or obtain an abortion. ***And as Texas has recently shown, a State can turn neighbor against neighbor, enlisting fellow citizens in the effort to root out anyone who tries to get an abortion, or to assist another in doing so." [Emphasis added]***

67. SCOTUS Minority has as such entirely shared its identical view with Petitioner herein in this matter, amazingly even concerning my claims against Defendants herein for their violation of my copyrighted intellectual property, entitled THE CCO NETWORK [See, A: 11-14] using private citizens to detect and prosecute concerted organized crimes. The only difference is that the Minority Court has failed to be more resolute in its power of CORRECT reasoning based on **ABSOLUTE RELATIVITY** as the supreme principle of the changing universe, showing that the Majority has erred as a matter of logic and rationality based on outdated traditional Aristotelian logic of non-contradiction, **not knowing how to appropriately balance the competing vital interests between the fetus's life and that of its mother, the host woman**, who may be either the greatest benefactor in its life to come, as literally giving it LIFE, if one believes in the so-called God 1.0 of the Jewish Torah, and now under color of State law, but in fact unconstitutionally, by the heartless and brainless misogynist Defendants-Respondents herein, or the fetus' worst enemy, depending on her power to choose as given her by the U.S. Constitution under the RIGHTS TO LIFE, LIBERTY, PROPERTY, PRIVACY, AND THE PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS.

68. It is of note that SCOTUS Minority's *Dobbs* June 24 2022 Opinion was written and published subsequent to Petitioner's May 7 2022 service and filing of summons and complaint in *Dmt MacTruong v. G. Abbott, et al.* in the U.S. District Court for the Western District, Austin Division, Texas, Dkt No. 1-22-Cv-476. USCA5 Dkt No. 22-51024. As such, I was not at all an opportunist, who just adopted the Minority Court's correct position in this matter. On the contrary, I may even claim the great unexpected honor that the Minority Court might have adopted mine, which in fact is that of any jurist and lawyer, who knows how to reason with AR logic, and pursuant to the spirit and literal guidance of the U.S. Constitution.

69. **Clearly, had the Majority Court, with 6 Defendants-Respondents herein, been better educated with open minds in general culture and specifically trained to think, reason, decide, and act justly, fairly, and appropriately according to the correct principle of ABSOLUTE RELATIVITY, instead of the limited Aristotelian logic of non-contradiction, as explained rationally hereinabove, hereinafter, and in Petitioner's 414-Page book under that title,** then obviously the Court would have preserved *Roe* and rejected *Dobbs*, and America would not have been put, as right now, in the mightiest turmoil and legal chaos, we have not been since the end of the 19th Century Civil War.

70. Incidentally, Chief Justice John Roberts, knowing full well the value of the balancing acts that SCOTUS must have performed almost routinely in most cases since the Court's first decisions, has tried to be **in the middle between *Roe* and *Dobbs***. So too did misogynist U.S. Senator Lindsey Graham more recently.

71. Notwithstanding, **RPR IN AR *[See, A: 45-50, 58 and 60 for its simple and straightforward meaning]*** does not always mean splitting a conflicting piece of the human collective brain (a group of people in simple language) into two halves and trying to sneak in the middle and call it a truce or fair deal, and as such, their similar apparently moderate suggestions to address this issue of the CBA woman's constitutional rights to life, liberty, property, privacy, and pursuit of happiness cannot be accepted but must be rejected outright, **and *Roe v. Wade* should be fully, not partly, restored by any court of competent jurisdiction or ultimately by this Supreme Court in the instant civil action.**

72. It is of note that a fair and just Court of law such as SCOTUS cannot function if two thirds of its members are composed of five Defendants herein, who are undisputedly proven on reliable public records, known to all informed American citizens, to be hard-core misogynists, criminals, cheaters, liars, and corrupted. **[A: 41, 42, 43, 44]**

73. It would be then in the interest of justice and judicial economy, that this Court disregards the incorrect misogynist Ohio District Court and the USCA6's Dismissal Order(s), being appealed, [A: 1-10-e] and adjudicate this case in accordance with the reasoning and opinion of SCOTUS Minority Dissenting Justices in *Dobbs,* which opinion is, of course, neither misogynist nor unconstitutional, as any judgment of a U.S. federal court should be as a matter of law.

74. Bluntly, unknown to the public, people with the wrongful misogynist conviction such as the Respondents herein and their blind evil criminal heartless and brainless followers, are literally lethal predators and enemies of our beloved innocent CBA women. For these women to live and be able to experience freedom and happiness, as they are entitled to under the U.S. Constitution, Defendants-Respondents, and their followers, must be literally removed from every federal bench of the USA, including SCOTUS, after having

been referred to the U.S. Department of Justice for investigation and indictment. They should be further directed to correct themselves from their usual unconstitutional misogynist way of reasoning and start making and enforcing non-misogynist legislation by appropriate judgments, education, and extensive practice of RPR IN AR. **[See, A: 45-50, 58 and 60 for its simple and straightforward meaning]**

75. One good and easy rule of thumb to understand and practice RPR IN AR is to be strong and kind, but always moderate, wise, intelligently adapted, upgraded, balanced, and not radical or extremist in one's view, belief, or action.

76. **Viewing the foregoing, Petitioner herein respectfully asks this Highest Court of America to take this unique opportunity to not only bring justice and fairness, but also peace, unity, reason, progress, wisdom, civilization, and creativity to America,** starting by striking down Respondents' misogynist anti-abortion legislation everywhere under the Court's subject-matter jurisdiction in so far as it undisputedly violates the most basic principles already appropriately laid down by *Roe v. Wade* and the U.S. Constitution, which protect all American citizens' rights to life, liberty, property, privacy, and the pursuit of happiness, and granting all reasonable relief sought in Petitioner's Complaint, and/or Motion for Summary Judgment.

GROUNDS UPON WHICH THIS PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI SHOULD BE GRANTED

77. The facts and circumstances of this case glaringly and undisputedly show on public court records that:

(a) The United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit has entered a decision in total conflict with its prior decisions and those of a majority of other United States Court of Appeals on the same important issue regarding women's right to safely induced miscarriages in that the Court has so far departed from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings or sanctioned such a departure by a U.S. Court of Appeals, as to call for an exercise of this USSC's supervisory power.

(b) To be right on the point, no other U.S. Courts of Appeals have demonstrated an open departure from *Roe v. Wade* ruling after June 24 2022 *Dobbs v. Jackson* ruling, causing undisputedly (i) deep mistrust for the first time ever by the American public in the wisdom and sense of justice of this highest Court of the land, and (ii) America to go back about 162 years to the pre-Civil War condition as in 1861, when the South formally separated from the North, and President Lincoln declared war to save the Union.

(c) As such, in the interest of justice and for the sake of effectively defending any litigant's most fundamental constitutional right to due process, this Supreme Court of the United States of America should absolutely intervene and reverse the USCA6's failure to put the U.S. District Court , Southern District of Ohio, Western Division, on the right tract of justice that has been established by President Lincoln at the cost of more than 600,000 American lives and his own on April 15, 1865, and strongly affirmed by the 1866 and 1964 Civil Rights Acts, and *Roe v. Wade* on January 22, 1973.

CONCLUSION

8. What action do you want SCOTUS to take in your case?

78. All Defendants-Respondents herein are admittedly Respondent Trump's co-conspirators, misogynists, criminals, anti-constitutional, anti-American, and murderers. Defendant Trump's misogynism was determined to be a fact by a preponderance of the evidence, in May 2023, by a jury after a civil trial in the SDNY. SCOTUS Respondents need to be legally removed from SCOTUS to restore the dignity, decorum, and honor of this one of the very few most respected and trusted American institutions left.

79. As such, may it please this Supreme Court of America not to allow these criminals to soil it in CBA women's blood, shame, and humiliation one second further. Our women have been liberated for 49 years. They won't and should not be compelled by Respondents under color of State law to go back in time to cages or waterbeds to be raped, sometimes at 10 years of age, without even having the legal option of getting a safely induced miscarriage in privacy while fighting back their rapists in court or recovering from such terrifying and humiliating drastically life-changing ordeals. **[A: 22-25]**

80. To be accurate, the Ohioan HRHPA, which was signed into State law after the Texan THA, is much worse than the Jim Crow laws or the 1865-1866 Black Codes, and an egregious violation of the 1866 and 1964 Civil Rights Acts and this Court's 1973 *Roe v. Wade*.

81. The U.S. Constitution must have the first and final legal words on what to do with any foreign object entering with or without CBA women's permission inadvertently or intentionally in their vaginas or uteruses. CBA women's rights to life, liberty, property, privacy, and pursuit of happiness are openly and undisputedly protected by the U.S. Constitution. These rights may not be second-guessed by any brainless and heartless

hypocritical demagogue misogynist politician, legislator, or judge, who cheated their way to sit on federal benches, including the U.S. Supreme Court, or who, like the Respondents herein, can be proven to lie to destroy the U.S. Constitution instead of upholding it, as they are sworn in under oath to, deserves the death penalty for treason, or at least a life in prison for having calculatedly committed such Hitlerian and sadistic heinous mass felonies against millions of our beloved CBA women with their irrational unconstitutional illegal misogynist State anti-abortion legislation, unscientifically and arbitrarily defining when a blood clot can be deemed life and given "legal personhood" protection.

82. As duly and correctly noted by Minority SCOTUS, *Dobbs* ruling is so divisive for America that Respondents Alito *et al.* have set our people on the brink of a second civil war for the North Blue States to fight the South Red ones to liberate all American women this time, instead of black slaves as during the First by the great President Abraham Lincoln upholding the U.S. Constitution at any cost, including more than 600,000 American lives and his own. Respondents Alito *et al.* are so murderous and heartless and legally uneducated on logical reasoning that it would be much better for the American people just to put them physically and quickly out of action, instead of our nation going into another devastating murderous civil war.

83. Notwithstanding, no violence should be required to remove these criminal liars and traitors from SCOTUS, because as a matter of law this noble Supreme Court has all the power under the Constitution to discipline itself by referring them to the U.S. DOJ for further investigation, indictment, and prosecution, for such serious actual crimes of sexual harassment, sexual abuses, voluntary homicide, or even first-degree murders, while fully respecting their constitutional rights to due process, precious rights that they have heartlessly denied to innocent rape victims of 10-years of age, by the unconstitutional and illegal *Dobbs* ruling, and have set our nation on the brink of civil war.

THE CORRECT WAY FOR THIS COURT TO HELP AMERICA AND OUR ENTIRE PLANET MEET OUR GREATEST CHALLENGE IN THE YEARS AND DECADES TO COME

84. Undisputedly humanity will not be able to elevate itself to the next level of interplanetary civilization in the years and decades to come if we cannot upgrade the way we reason, think, speak, and act to implement our correct thoughts and ensure that our positive collective plans of action for the future are carried out by all humankind as one community living together peacefully under one unifying system of law based on RPR IN AR by universal education and universal partnership. [See, A: 45-50]

85. It's time however for America and our entire planet to courageously face the ultimate challenge of our cultural, spiritual, scientific, and technological evolution. Externally, we now must daily face such hostile powerful national forces as those of China, Russia, North Korea, and Iran. Internally, we are confronted with violence-provoking issues of discrimination based on race, ethnicity, sex, gender, culture, morality, politics, and religion. All the foregoing challenges can be easily met with our collective understanding of the supreme principle of our changing universe: **Absolute Relativity**, which holds the key to our discovery of truth and justice, wisdom, balance, moderation, and reasonability, and which is the essential element leading us to universal peace and harmony that will open our greater collective vision and allow the entire human race to make the new bold steps forward to rise together to the next level of interplanetary civilization, saving our planet from both natural and man-made disasters such as climatstrophe, pandemics, deforestation, floods, wildfires, droughts, hurricanes, global pollutions, hunger, wars, crimes, frauds, rapes, overpopulation, underpopulation, sexual frustration, lack of affordable renewable energy. As such, **understanding and applying Absolute Relativity is the key to our new world of peace, freedom, happiness, and positive creativity to come.**

86. Luckily for all humankind, Absolute Relativity, **[See, A: 50, 58 and 60 for its simple and straightforward meaning]** as the ultimate principle of logical reasoning to pursue truth and do justice for every human being of all ages, can be learned, understood, expanded, widely practiced, and upgraded. Truth, justice, peace, collective scientific inner harmony and partnership, and exterior technological progress will be achieved in America and the whole planet Earth when all lawyers, judges, political leaders, and legislators would have proven that they had been taught in schools this ultimate method of reasoning and mastered it before they are licensed to practice law and duly sworn in to uphold the principles and high ideals of the U.S. Constitution, the most balanced and wisest political and legal document the world has ever written, believed in and forcefully practiced in good faith with the Principle of Absolute Relativity always present in all minds and total realities.

87. It is of note that the new **WORLD STRUCTURE Constitution [See, A: 59]** that was written by Petitioner herein back in 1975 to lead legally and peacefully all humanity to the next level of interplanetary civilization has been deeply inspired by the U.S. Constitution with Absolute Relativity as the logical foundation and ultimate breakthrough.

88. In substance, our entire planet will be governed by **THE WORLD STRUCTURE,** a kind of world government of, by, and for all humankind, on a federal, republican, democratic, and liberal basis. **[See, A: 19-20, 25-28, 32-40, 45-50, 59]**

89. Finally, with due respect, Petitioner submits hereinafter the **very short Table of Content of my SUPER BOOK entitled SUPERHUMANKIND IN ACTION** for the Court to review and recognize that AR is indeed the legal principle and spirit to be learned and practiced worldwide if a wonderful future for all humankind is to be legally developed and secured. **[See, A: 32-40]** It took Petitioner almost 50 years to write it from scratch based on my learning, experience, and creativity after having grown up and was most seriously educated with a purpose, mission, and vision in literally three most brilliant civilizations in the world of all time: Asia, Europe, and America. **[A: 29-31, 51-53]**

90. SUPERHUMANKIND IN ACTION THE BOOK reflects substantively the logic, reasoning, and spirit of the Principle of Absolute Relativity as undisputedly described in 20 Simple Statements without Explanation or Demonstration, which can be reviewed at **A: 58** and **A: 60.**

91. In simple final words, all Petitioner herein strongly wishes now, in the highest interest of the American people, as one single legal living entity, more commonly known as a nation of law, is this dutiful Supreme Court performs its duty under the U.S. Constitution and Congressional statutes, and the American spirit, by which the Court has been established with great power and honor to recognize directly or implicitly that indeed, unlike the main teaching of the Jewish Torah, Aristotelian Organon, Christians' New Testament that truth is one and unchanged. **TRUTH IS ONE AND MULTIPLE. IT IS IMMUTABLE, AND CONSTANTLY CHANGING.** Every man-made statement, including of course the Jewish Torah, Aristotelian Organon, Christians' New Testament, the U.S. Constitution, U.S. Congressional statutes, every court's decision, within or without the U.S. legal system, is relative, i.e., one and multiple, immutable, and constantly changing. They all can and will be under the proper control of **Universal Intelligence,** which is naturally and inevitably a balanced and intelligent combination of human and artificial intelligence as we will all know it, while confidently progressing based on the principle of diversity toward the absolute diversified manifestation in all directions, and inversely based on the principle of identity to constantly return to their ultimate one universal essence, all that through infinite learning and practicing RPR IN AR. **[A: 32-40, 45-50, 58-60]**

92. The ultimate key to open this elusive but wonderful state of TRUTH and REALITY is to locate a system of reference, find the related fragments thereof, connect them by their identity or common point, and still understand and accept that the latter is itself temporary and fragmented due to their inherent endless diversity.

93. As such, currently, for America to effectively protect the CBA women's constitutional rights to control their bodies and health, the following guidance is undisputed and should be carefully followed.

94. By the will of most Americans, since 1789, the U.S. Constitution has reigned supreme on this land of the free and the brave. **Being written in 1787, ratified in 1788, and in operation since 1789, the U.S. Constitution is the world's longest surviving written charter of government.** No uttered word in America can be deemed higher authority unless the Constitution has been appropriately amended or abolished, like traitor Defendant Trump and his supporters tried to violently do but failed on January 6, 2021. **[A: 57]**

95. As a result, since none of the defendants herein have appeared in this civil action to oppose Petitioner's complaint and motion for summary judgment, hence they admitted and agreed with Petitioner that *Roe* is undisputedly a constitutional ruling, while *Dobbs* is not, this U.S. Supreme Court has no choice but to declare as a matter of constitutional law that the Ohian HRHPA, or any comparable State anti-abortion legislation, being unconstitutional and an egregious violation of *Roe v. Wade,* is annulled and voided for the sake of America's free Republic, Liberal Democracy, the safety and happiness of millions of its beloved CAB women.

WHEREFORE, may it please this Supreme Court to hold dear reason, justice, the U.S. Constitution, the 1866 and 1964 Civil Rights Acts, the 1973 *Roe v. Wade* ruling, and (i) grant Petitioner herein an order directing that the Ohian HRHPA or any comparable anti-abortion State legislation under the jurisdiction of this Court, is annulled and voided, and (ii) grant all other and further appropriate ancillary relief, such as fining Respondents herein Ten Dollars or more for their use without prior leave by Petitioner herein of my copyrighted intellectual property entitled the CCO Network, [See, A: 11-14] or otherwise as the Court may deem just, proper, and reasonable in the premises.

Dated: June 8, 2023,

Dmt MacTruong, Petitioner *pro se*

Additional material from this filing is available in the Clerk's Office.