

22-7838

No. \_\_\_\_\_

FILED  
JUN 17 2023  
OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT U.S.  
**ORIGINAL**

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

TORI SMITH — PETITIONER

(Your Name)

vs.

JEHOVAH'S WITNESSES ET. AL.— RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT RICHMOND, VA

NO. 22-2309

---

(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

TORI SMITH

(Your Name)

600 BUCKEYE CIRCLE SE

---

(Address)

CONYERS GA 30094

---

(City, State, Zip Code)

443-743-8805

(Phone Number)

## QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1. This case is based on Racist Discrimination against the Plaintiff, a Black Woman that is being barredblocked from filling a lawsuit against a White Women's organization, namely, the National Organization of Women<sup>1</sup> (NOW) (*Dred Scott vs. Sanford* (1857) (U.S. Const. Amend. 8). This block was by Judge Leonie M. Brinkema, of the U S District Court Eastern District of Virginia, located in Alexandria, VA, Order February 11, 2022. Judge Leonie M. Brinkema's decision has been upheld by the Court of Appeals Fourth Circuit of Richmond, VA. According to Judge Brinkema, the Plaintiff's claims against NOW "cannot be true". The Judge was nowhere around when the following started by NOW due to their political might: blocking medical care, making death threats, actively participating in domestic terror stalking, making home invasions, privacy invasions, promises to 'never leave that nigger alone'. Since the Plaintiff is not a White Woman with claims of Civil Rights violations, the Plaintiff's claims were considered: "delusional, fanciful, unbelievable," etc., per Judge Brinkema. Hence, the Plaintiff has twice been denied the Justice of the Due Process System by Judge Brinkema (Amdt14.S1.3.1).
2. The Plaintiff is a Black Woman facing religious discrimination (Jehovah's Witnesses) when it comes to domestic violence, as nothing was ever done to: arrest, investigate, prosecute members of the Jehovah's Witnesses (my ex-husband & his friends) organization to this day. This is the reason, to this date, the Plaintiff remain: harassed & stalked. The Plaintiff should live free of religious persecution by religious members. The Plaintiff would not be granted an automatic court hearing with Claims of Defamation (*New Times vs. Sullivan* (1964) asking for millions in compensation. The Plaintiff is being discriminated by the Department of Justice (DOJ), that will do nothing to stop them because NOW are White Women and the Plaintiff is a Black Woman. Also, the Plaintiff has been blocked from filing Hate Crimes (Chapter 13, Civil Rights Section 249) reports by Police, "Just because someone calls you Black or a Nigger, don't mean that they are Racists."

## LIST OF PARTIES

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

[ X] All parties **do not** appear in the caption of the case on the cover page. A list of all parties to the proceeding in the court whose judgment is the subject of this petition is as follows:

National Organization of Women (NOW)  
W.E.A.V.E. (of Sacramento, CA)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW .....	1
JURISDICTION .....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED .....	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....	4
ARGUMENTS .....	5
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT .....	10
CONCLUSION.....	12

## **INDEX TO APPENDICES**

### **APPENDIX A**

U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT RICHMOND, VA

NO. 22-2309

### **APPENDIX B**

U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT RICHMOND, VA

NO. 22-1158

### **APPENDIX C**

U.S. DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA ALEXANDRIA, VA

NO. 1:22-cv-123(LMB/TCB)

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE
<i>Dred Scott vs. Sanford (1857)</i> .....	(i)
<i>New Times vs. Sullivan (1964)</i> .....	(i)
<i>Puckett v. United States (2009)</i> .....	(4)
<i>Roe vs. Wade (2022)</i> .....	(6)
<i>Johnson v. United States (1997)</i> .....	(8)
<i>Gideon v. Wainwright (1963)</i> .....	(8)
<i>Waller v. Georgia (1984)</i> .....	(8)
<i>Williams v. Fears (1900)</i> .....	(8)
<i>Papachristou v. Jacksonville (1972)</i> .....	(8)
<i>Kent v. Dulles (1958)</i> .....	(8)
<i>Brom and Bett vs. Ashley (1781)</i> .....	(10)
<i>Commonwealth of Massachusetts vs. Mellon (1923)</i> .....	(11)
<i>O'Connor vs Donaldson (1975)</i> .....	(11)

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

**OPINIONS BELOW**

**[X ] For cases from federal courts:**

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix A  
to the petition and is  
[ ] reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
[ ] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or, [X] is  
unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix B  
to the petition and is

[ ] reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
[ ] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or, [X] is  
unpublished.

**[ ] For cases from state courts:**

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix  
to the \_\_\_\_\_  
petition and is

[ ] reported \_\_\_\_\_ at ; or,

[ ] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or, [ ] is  
unpublished.

The opinion of \_\_\_\_\_ the  
court \_\_\_\_\_ to the petition and is  
appears at \_\_\_\_\_; or,  
Appendix  
[ ] reported at  
[ ] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or, [ ] is  
unpublished.

## JURISDICTION

**[X] For cases from federal courts:**

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my  
case was April 24, 2023.

- [ ] No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.
- [ ] A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: \_\_\_\_\_, and a ~~copy of the order denying rehearing~~ appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_.
- [ ] An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including (date) on \_\_\_\_\_ (date) in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1254(1). [ ] For cases from **state courts:**

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was. A copy of that decision appears at.

- [ ] A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: \_\_\_\_\_, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_.

[ ] An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including (date) on \_\_\_\_\_ (date) in  
Application No. — A — .

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

## **CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED**

U.S. Const. Amend. 1.....	3,5,8
U.S. Const. Amend. 13.....	7
U.S. Const. Amend. 8.....	i,8
Amdt. 14.S1.3.1.....	3

The case matter was never at trial for any Constitutional violations (U.S. Const. Amend. 1; U.S. Const. Amend. 4; U.S. Const. Amend. 6; U.S. Const. Amend. 7; U.S. Const. Amend. 8; U.S. Const. Amend. 13) nor Federal Criminal violations, and to this day the Plaintiff is still being victimized due to no legal actions/remedies on the part of Law Enforcement. The Plaintiff has been denied the Justice of the Due Process System (Amdt14.S1.3.1) as Domestic Violence has led to a preponderance-of-evidence of viable events or situations that ever existed or ever took place. Therefore, the Plaintiff is seeking the Justices to render Justice that should have been rendered long ago, in accordance with §985(a) Civil forfeiture of real property; §986. Subpoenas for bank records; §1514. Civil action to restrain harassment of a victim or witness; §1593. Mandatory restitution (a)(b)(1)(2)(3); §1595A(A) Civil injunctions and permanent seal all matter (a)(b)(c)(1)(2)(A)(B); § §2323. Forfeiture, destruction, and restitution.

The Petitioner suggests (Pet. 16, 21-22) that the Court could grant the petition for a writ of certiorari, vacate the decision of the Appellate because:

1. Petitioner principally contends (Pet. 16-23) that the Judge improperly commented on petitioner's state of mind and provided legal untruth opinions about her case matter.
2. On Dismissal, according to Iqbal<sup>1</sup>, 'even after twombly and iqbal, many appellate court decisions instruct the district courts to use caution in dismissing complaints and have

---

<sup>1</sup>[https://www.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/iqbalmemo\\_112311.pdf](https://www.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/iqbalmemo_112311.pdf)

- reversed dismissals where the district courts failed to presume the facts to be true or required the plaintiff to plead with too much particularity.’
3. Because petitioner was denied a trial, the court of appeals reviewed those arguments for plain error, Pet. App. 22a-23a, 25a, which requires petitioner to show “an error or defect” that was “clear or obvious,” that “affected [petitioner’s] substantial rights,” and that “‘seriously affects the fairness, integrity or public reputation of judicial proceedings,’” Puckett v. United States, 556 U.S. 129, 135 (2009) (brackets and citation omitted).

### STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This case matter, in entirety, is criminal and racist discrimination that involves years of cover-ups & dismissals, the reason why nothing has been done over the years. The Plaintiff is a black person, therefore, the usual, ‘Fell through the Cracks’; ‘The System Failed You’; & ‘A Victim of Systemic Racism’. Nothing ever done, to this date, to put an end to the many crimes being committed over the years, dismissals, and Joiners getting involved. This case matter of Domestic Violence begun when the Plaintiff’s ex-husband began plotting to get rid of his wife. This murder plot begun when the ex-husband came into some money, due to auto accidents & decided he needed to get rid of his wife. The Plaintiff’s ex-husband begun to slowly poison his ex-wife back in the 1990’s. The Plaintiff’s ex-husband got into some congregational troubles, being accused of touching other women. Upon finding this out, the Plaintiff legally separated from the ex-husband in 1998 & relocated to Maryland. The Plaintiff’s ex-husband followed & pursued the Plaintiff blaming the Plaintiff for all his problems. The Plaintiff had to file for the first Order of Protection (2000) that was ignored by the religious congregation of Jehovah’s Witnesses. Hence, the ex-husband continued to conspire with other members of his congregation to get rid of his ex-wife. (§1111. MURDER; §1113. Attempt to commit murder or manslaughter; §1117. Conspiracy to murder against the Plaintiff; The Defendants violated §1201 Kidnapping; (§2261. Interstate domestic violence (2)). The Primary Defendants are Jehovah’s Witnesses & the other Defendants (Joiners), unless otherwise stated. The Plaintiff’s Federal Civil Lawsuit listed as Defendants: Jehovah’s Witnesses Organization<sup>2</sup> (JWs); National Organizations of Women<sup>3</sup> (NOW); & W.E.A.V.E<sup>4</sup>. (of Sacramento, CA) in additional to other Joiners. This has led to the case matter coming before the United States Supreme Court.

---

<sup>2</sup> JWs - We live in over 230 countries and come from many ethnic and cultural backgrounds. You may be familiar with our preaching work, but we also help local communities in other important ways.

<https://www.jw.org/en/jehovahs-witnesses/>

<sup>3</sup>The National Organization for Women (NOW) is an American feminist organization. Founded in 1966, it is legally a 501(c)(4) social welfare organization. The organization consists of 550 chapters in all 50 U.S. states and in Washington, D.C. It is the largest feminist organization in the United States with around 500,000 members.

<sup>4</sup> WEAVE is the primary provider of crisis intervention services for survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault in Sacramento County. WEAVE’s mission is to promote safe and healthy relationships and support survivors of sexual assault, domestic violence and sex trafficking.

## ARGUMENT

1. The Defendants are in violation of attempting, plotting to carryout §1111. MURDER; §1113. Attempt to commit murder or manslaughter; & §1117. Conspiracy to murder against the Plaintiff. The Defendants violated §1201 Kidnapping by holding the Plaintiff in 'stasis' until sometime of torture of Plaintiff was carried out, so no medical help could be sought out. The main culprits were Jehovah's Witnesses located in Riverdale, MD & the DMV area, they included: ex-husband Ralph Everett, Jr.; Michael Morris, Horace Martin, Kenneth Hill, Nola Hill (no relations), & Ava J. Brown. The Plaintiff later had to file charges against Michael Morris (2002), Horace Martin (2004), & K. Hill (2004). Also, The Plaintiff would later be placed under arrest for assault in an altercation with A. Brown (2011). This murder plot begun when the ex-husband came into some money, due to an auto accident & decided he needed to get rid of his wife. The Plaintiff legally separated from my ex-husband in 1998 & relocated to Maryland. He followed and was very angry, as the first Order of Protection (2000) was obtained. The ex-husband was still in the Maryland area planning & plotting his revenge, disabled the Plaintiff to no longer engage in electrical work. The Plaintiff went to the Prince George's County Police on many occasions, but nothing would be done. The Plaintiff also filed reports with the Prince George's County High Commissioner, but again, nothing would be done. The Plaintiff traveled to Baltimore to speak with the MD Attorney General's office, but again, nothing would be done, as this situation escalated. The Plaintiff had the right to religious freedom. (U.S. Const. Amend. 1) The Plaintiff maintains that had the initial arrests & prosecutions were made in 2002, this matter would have gone no further.
2. The Defendants have committed and are in gross and flagrant violations of §2340A(a)(b)(a) TORTURE and Conspiracy to commit and carry out. The Primary Defendants continue to conspire and to pursue the Plaintiff to torture and to torment the Plaintiff to death, "every moment of the day": drive-byers, passer-byers, harassments, hate, torments, encouraging national and foreign citizens and communities to join. The Plaintiff was solely attacked by white women because of her being black. In the true sense of Emmett Till<sup>5</sup>, the Plaintiff was accused of "attacking the President of W.E.A.V.E." (2006). Then became a subject of racial hatred by other white women of Sacramento, CA. The Plaintiff had never met this person nor was at their W.E.A.V.E. facility that was located just a few doors down. Hence, from such false claims, the Plaintiff was subjected to:

---

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Emmett-Till>

W.E.A.V.E.'s staff & clients, "We going to give her black ass a heart attack!" The Plaintiff filed a Police Report with the Sacramento Police Dept. (2006) Then the Plaintiff was followed back to Washington, D.C. by W.E.A.V.E. W.E.A.V.E., in turn, made complaints about the Plaintiff to NOW, and is constantly pursued by NOW (the Plaintiff once did some brief volunteer work at NOW-Wash. D.C.). The Plaintiff filed for an Injunction against both Jehovah's Witnesses & W.E.A.V.E. in Rockville, MD, located in Montgomery County MD (2008). NOW's biggest claims to women's rights include abortions and domestic violence. The Plaintiff has never needed an abortion nor abortion services. The Plaintiff had nothing to do with Abortionists that played politics and gambled with their reproductive organs and lost. *Roe vs. Wade* 2022. Abortionists, in turn, want everyone to feel their terror & wrath, as some of the U.S. Supreme Justices have experienced. Abortions against women of color, especially black women (Planned Parenthood) was founded by racist & eugenicist Margaret Sanger who explained, in her own words, "We do not want word to go out that we want to exterminate the Negro population....")<sup>6</sup> Abortionists have a hatred & a vengeance against women of color.

3. The Primary Defendants are in gross violation §373(a) (b) (c) Solicitation to commit a crime of violence; with intent that another person engaged in conduct constituting a felony that has as an element the use, attempted use, or threatened use of physical force against person/property.
4. The Defendants have committed and are in gross and flagrant violations of §2241 (a)(1)(2)(1)(2)(A)(B) Aggravated sexual abuse; §2242 (B) Sexual abuse physically incapable of declining participation in; §2242 (1)(2)(A)(B) Sexual abuse constant threats of sexual abuse to occur; §2245. Offenses to result in death of the Plaintiff; Hence, in accordance with §2248(a)(b)(1 )(2) (3)(A)(B)(C)(D) (E) (F) Mandatory restitution, the Plaintiff is requesting the Judge/Justices to immediately award and orders for maximum fines and imprisonment sentences including life. The Plaintiff relocated to Washington, D.C. & Jehovah's Witnesses had an MPD Officer that she did computer work for, to Sexual Assault the Plaintiff (2004), accordingly, 'They all watched it take place' via video. This led to another angry person pursuing the Plaintiff to avoid arrest and loss of job. The MPD Officer was tipped off that the Plaintiff was going to file a report against, so that the MPD Officer begun harassing, threatening the Plaintiff. This new Defendant used the very same degrading accusations (the biggest ho, slut, etc.) & name calling as the original culprits. When the Plaintiff relocated to other states (CA, DE, WVA) the MPD Officer added claims/spread rumors that the Plaintiff was mentally ill & lied on an innocent Officer. This led to hatred from other Police in other states.

---

<sup>6</sup>The Pivot of Civilization (1926) and The Medical and Eugenic Aspects of Birth Control (1926)  
<https://www.michaeljournal.org/articles/societal-debates/item/margaret-sanger-the-founder-of-planned-parenthood>

5. The Defendants have committed and are in gross and flagrant violations of §2261 (a)(1)(2) Interstate domestic violence as the Primary Defendants pursues the Plaintiff so that the Plaintiff was constantly forced to relocate and threaten personal safety; §2261A (1)(A)(i)(B)(2)(A)(B) Stalking violations in any and all public places whether publicly or privately owned with intent to kill, injure, harass, or intimidate and, place in reasonable fear of the death of, or serious bodily injury including and not limited to: airports, apartments, beaches, cities, city parks, colleges, hospitals, metros, public and private libraries, places of recreation, subways, etc.; §2262 (a)(1)(2) Interstate violation of protection order, the Plaintiff was granted 1st Order of Protection against ex-husband, and as in the violations of their Separation Agree to live separate lives with friends, etc., the ex-husband and his friends sent: language, messages, photos (digital altered sex images of sexual act(s)) to encourage physical bodily harm and death of Plaintiff. Hence, in accordance with §2264 Restitution (a)(b)(1)(2)(3)(A)(B)(C)(D) (E)(F)(G), the Plaintiff request the Judge/Justices to order and issue maximum fines and imprisonment sentences.
6. The Defendants committed to conspire the Plaintiff to a life SLAVERY & TRAFFICKING by; §1581. Peonage; obstructing enforcement claiming that the Plaintiff “needs to go back home”; §1583. Enticement into slavery claiming that the Plaintiff wants to be used and should be kept being the sex slave they made her to be; §1584. Sale into involuntary servitude with claims of “it was only for a \$1 bet”; §1589. Forced labor with claims of “it’s the only way the Plaintiff will earn money -- by being the biggest ho, hole, slut, whore, etc.”; §1590. Trafficking “to be carried out by all and any”. Hence, as the Plaintiff was to remain in and or under such conditions until in Plaintiff’s 90s. The Plaintiff is requesting the Judge/Justices to immediately enforce §1593. Mandatory restitution and §1595A. Civil injunctions made payable by all and any engaged and cease and desist issued to the Defendants main headquarters: agencies and organizations along with affiliates, associates, partners, etc., as the Defendants wanted to have the Plaintiff living in captivity and enslavement: endangered, permanent homelessness, unemployed, etc. The Defendants planned on pursuing the Plaintiff in any territory violations of §1596. Also, additional jurisdiction in certain trafficking offenses, “no matter what country, anywhere” due to international/global contacts, networking, offices, etc. (U.S. Const. Amend. 13, §1)
7. The Defendants are in violation of the following Obstruction of Justice statutes including: §1507. Picketing or parading; §1510. Obstruction of criminal investigations; §1511. Obstruction of State or local law enforcement; §1512. Tampering with a witness, victim, or an informant; §1513. Retaliating against a witness, victim, or an informant. Hence, the Plaintiff is requesting the Judge/Justices to immediately issue §1514. Civil action to restrain to the Defendants agencies and organizations associates, friends, members, etc. Also,

enforcement and imposed fines until remedy of all and any such activities cease to exist and or end. Also, the Defendants have cause civil disorder and are in violation of §231 to impede local and federal investigations.

Johnson v. United States, 520 U. S. 461, 468 (1997) (citing Gideon v. Wainwright, 372 U. S. 335 (1963) (complete denial of counsel); (U.S. Const. Amend. 8). The Plaintiff was arrested (2011) for a fight bail went from \$250 - \$25,000 overnight. The Plaintiff was denied a trial (2022) and cannot afford counsel.

Waller v. Georgia, 467 U. S. 39 (1984) (denial of public trial); The Prince George's County Police & Prosecutor (Ivey) would never arrest, investigate, etc. Instead, the Plaintiff was put out of the Prince George's Courthouse in Upper Marlboro, MD for trying to get a trial against the ex-husband. In fact, the Plaintiff was escorted to the Sheriff to be arrested.

The Plaintiff faces constant women bias hate. The Plaintiff has had two New York Supreme women Judges (2018) that blocked case against NOW. The Plaintiff was granted for case to proceed. However, when the case was to Proceed with Motion to Judgment, upon entering the courthouse, the Plaintiff was struck from behind, placed in handcuffs by two women court officers, and locked in a holding cell to miss court. The Plaintiff was falsely accused the New York Attorney General (James 2019) of "must have done something to attack court agents". The NY AG was not present at the time of detainment. Also, see Judge Leonie M. Brinkema's Order. (Appendix C)

8. The Primary & other Defendants violated §241, §242, §245(a) (1) (2) (B) (C) (D) (E) (4) (A) (B) (5) , §246, §247 (2), §249 (a) (1) (A) (B) (2) (3) with Conspiracy against rights continues & to conspire to injure, oppress, threaten or intimidate, pursue the Plaintiff, with intent to prevent or hinder from free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege so secured, by road rage, drive-by yells, walking in neighborhood yells, etc. Assuring that the Plaintiff would never again obtain employment, friends, family (§1091(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5)), housing, etc.
9. The Defendants are in violations of §2101(a)(1)(2)(3)(4) as the Defendants encircles and purses the Plaintiff to encourage and incite mob, riotous crowds to promote participants to commit acts of violence threats to relocate, "She can't live here or nowhere!" Williams v. Fears, 179 U. S. 270, 274 (1900); see also Papachristou v. Jacksonville, 405 U. S. 156, 164 (1972).
10. The Plaintiff individual's decision to remain in a public place of any choice is as much a part of liberty and freedom. Kent v. Dulles, 357 U. S. 116, 126 (1958) (U.S. Const. Amend. 1). The Defendants continue 'ease drop and/or use listening devices' so that any comments of the Plaintiff could be heard and attacked for any comments that could be heard. In the privacy of her residences, the Plaintiff has the right of freedom of speech as any other citizen. Chapter 13, Civil Rights Section 241 & Title 18, U.S.C. Section 241.

11. The Defendants are in violation of §1035 (a)(1)(2). False statements relating to health care matters regarding the Plaintiff's both mental and physical health. The Defendants violation of §1038(b)(c) deliberately spread False information about how the Plaintiff's lifestyle as to how suffered serious bodily injury hoping to result in death of Plaintiff. The Plaintiff has, "COPD, Drug & Sexual Abuse (the causes of her cancer & back injuries), Fear of her Partner, Fear on having no Food has been added to the Plaintiff medical chart." INOVA<sup>7</sup> (2021).
12. The Defendants of in violation of committing §2332b(a)(1)(A)(B)(2)(5)(A) DOMESTIC TERRORISM and threats of international terrorism outside of the United States against the Plaintiff. Per the Defendants NOW, "We will never stop f\_cking that nigger!"
13. The Defendants are in gross violations Privacy of §1801. (a)(b)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(A)(B) Video voyeurism by informing the Plaintiff and the Public, that cameras are in her bathroom & bedroom, and that they and anyone can see "everything", no matter the place of residency, the Defendants "are very Political" and use "all of their networking" to enter, gain access and to call out all of what is going on: bathing, body image, dressing and undressing, privates areas, and toilet usages – The Plaintiff's neighbors would comment, "They can see everything that woman is doing."; "How can they see in the dark, she has no lights on (she's exercising)." "They can't get enough of seeing that old lady." Apparently, the ex-husband & his friends made claims that, "They would have/need to keep following that big ho, slut, etc. to watch her with other men in her places." "They needed to know & see everything that she is doing." Hence, reporting of any activity: driving, shopping, traveling, walking, etc.
14. The Defendants are in violation of §1091(a)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5) to commit Genocide of Plaintiff by holding on to the Plaintiff to block, prevent, stop, any chances of getting pregnant to have a family. The Plaintiff's ex-husband began poisoning the Plaintiff by feeding the Plaintiff a toxic substance. "They are toxic, and exposure to pesticides can cause a number of health effects. They are linked to a range of serious illnesses and diseases from respiratory problems to cancer. Called endocrine disruptors, these chemicals are linked with developmental, reproductive, brain, immune, and other problems.<sup>8</sup>" The Defendants JWs, "We ruined her health!" The Defendants NOW, "We are glad that we followed her dumb ass and stayed on her black ass so that she would never get pregnant!"
15. The Defendants are in violation §1039(a)(4). Fraud and related activity in connection with obtaining the Plaintiff's phone information in order to 'hear' and send obscene phone messages.

---

<sup>7</sup><https://www.inova.org/>

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.neis.nih.gov/health/topics/agents/endocrine/index.cfm>

16. The Defendants are in violation of committing §2332b(a)(1)(A)(B)(2)(5)(A) Domestic TERRORISM and threats of international terrorism outside of the United States against the Plaintiff. The Defendants would shout, upon seeing the Plaintiff, "She will never get away from us!" "No one cares about her slut ass, no one is going to stop us!" Chapter 13, Civil Rights Section 241 & Title 18, U.S.C. Section 241
17. The Defendants have committed and are in gross and flagrant violations of §2340A(a)(b)(a) TORTURE and Conspiracy to commit and carry out. The Defendants continue to conspire and to pursue the Plaintiff to torture and to torment the Plaintiff to death, "every moment of the day" by: drive-byers, passer-byers, harassments, hate, torments, encouraging national and foreign citizens and communities to join. The Plaintiff was to be hunted down for the rest of her life.

#### **REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION**

1. The Plaintiff is requesting/seeking Justice that should have occurred and resolved long ago which began in 2002 that should have resulted in convictions and prison for the Defendants.
2. The Plaintiff has twice been denied filing a Civil Rights Lawsuit by a Judge that considered the Plaintiff 's Civil Rights and complaint as "delusional".
3. The Plaintiff deserved to have the Constitutional Rights allotted to live a full life. Chapter 21 Civil Rights Section 1983, Title 42 USC 1983.
4. The Plaintiff is requesting Restitution (§2264(a)(b)(c)(1)(2)(3)(A)(B)(C)(D)(E) (F)(4)) for all the: abuse, defamation, degradation, excessive cruelty, harm inflicted, and hate crimes caused by the Defendants: (JWs \$10B; NOW \$10B; W.E.A.V.E. \$5M) Chapter 13, Civil Rights Section 246. The Plaintiff is not owned nor the property of no one's.

*Brom and Bett v. Ashley* (1781). The Plaintiff is requesting Retribution ordered by means of seizing assets obtained from: affiliates, associates, bank accounts, cash, insurances, property, etc.

a. Jehovah's Witnesses

Emotional Distress (US \$5B) Punitive (\$5B)  
(Extreme Cruelty,  
Pain & suffering,  
Negligence, Torture)

b. National Organization of Women

Emotional Distress (US\$5B) Punitive (\$5B)  
(Extreme Cruelty,  
Pain & suffering,  
Negligence, Torture)

- |                             |  |
|-----------------------------|--|
| c. W.E.A.V.E. OF SACRAMENTO | Emotional Distress (US\$5M) Punitive(\$5M)<br>(Extreme Cruelty,<br>Pain & suffering,<br>Negligence, Torture) |
|-----------------------------|--|
5. The Plaintiff has particularized injuries which can be traced to legal violations. Aside from the ex-husband's poisonings (Cancer), he and his friends considered themselves killing the Plaintiff, which injured lower back (Disability) so the Plaintiff would no longer be able to carry out electrical employment. The Plaintiff will need lifetime medical care. Commonwealth of Massachusetts vs. Mellon (1923).
  6. The Plaintiff's ex-husband and his friends planned and plotted this entire diabolical and depraved scheme to attack, disable, drug, and hand Plaintiff over to white racist to ensure that "She would be stopped, get nothing, and have nothing!"
  7. The Plaintiff has attempted to relocate from east coast to west coast several times. While in New Castle, DE the Plaintiff was still being harassed and stalked by the ex-husband and his friends. Upon going to the New Castle Police to file a Police Report, the Plaintiff was accused of threatening to kill others and being a violent mentally ill person, by a white female Delaware Police Officer. The Plaintiff was detained and placed in a mental facility, against will for 72 hours or more. The Plaintiff had/has no mental illness and was a student at the time. O'Connor vs Donaldson (1975).
  8. The Plaintiff should have been allowed to pursue the culprits, instead the Plaintiff encountered fighting: Bad Cops, Bias/Prejudice Judges, Corrupt Prosecutors. Also, the Plaintiff is not an agent of the DOJ (Wash., D.C.) or the FBI (Wash., D.C.). Hence, the Plaintiff cannot carry out legal investigations and arrests.
  9. The Plaintiff deserved equal protection of the law (Chapter 21 Civil Rights Section 1983, Title 42 USC 1983) and the right to counsel the Plaintiff could not afford. The Plaintiff has/have the Right to Liberty and Life free from persecution.
  10. The Plaintiff was a Private Citizen and lived alone. However, now the Plaintiff has to seek asylum & seek a new identity in another country.

## CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,



TORI SMITH

Date: 06/16/23

(12)