

**IN THE SUPREME COURT  
OF THE UNITED STATES**

**USCA10 Civil Case No. 22-491-R**


-----  
Dmt MacTruong, Appellant-Petitioner v.  
Kevin Stitt, et al., Defendants-Appellees  
-----

**NOTICE OF MOTION**

**FOR AN ORDER GRANTING PETITIONER *PRO SE*'S LEAVE  
TO FILE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI EXCEEDING  
THE PAGE LIMIT REQUIRED BY THE COURT RULE 33.2(b)**

**PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that upon filing of Petitioner *pro se* Dmt MacTruong's Affirmation dated April 22, 2023, and its supporting papers, a MOTION shall be made, by submission of papers, before the Supreme Court of the United States on **Monday May 8, 2023, at 10:00 AM**, or any place or time hereafter as may be subsequently and expressly directed by the Court with prior written notice(s) to the parties, for an ORDER

1. GRANTING leave in the interest of justice and judicial economy to Petitioner to submit the instant PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI that exceeds the 40-page limit allowed by Court Rule 33.2(b), or in the alternative
2. GRANTING Petitioner a reasonable enlargement of time to re-edit and submit a shorter Petition as the Court may deem appropriate in this matter, and/or



3. GRANTING all other and further relief as the Court may deem fair, just, and appropriate in the circumstances.

PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE, that no memorandum of law shall be served with these papers **at this time** because movant is *pro se* and there is no novel issue of law, and opposition papers, if any, must be served upon movant and filed with the Court **7 days** **before the return date**, and that this motion will be **made by submission of the papers** and, except as otherwise directed in writing by the Court with rational and good-faith explanation, **neither appearance nor oral argument** will be required on the hearing date.

Dated: April 22, 2023

Respectfully Yours,

  
Dnt MacTruong, Petitioner  
875 Bergen Avenue  
Jersey City, NJ 20306  
(914) 215-2304

**Defendants-Appellees:**

Kevin Stitt,  
Greg McCortney,  
Charles McCall,  
Jim Olsen,  
Donald Trump,  
Virginia Thomas,  
Samuel A. Alito,  
Amy Coney Barrett,  
Neil Gorsuch,  
Brett Kavanaugh,  
Clarence Thomas.

**IN THE SUPREME COURT  
OF THE UNITED STATES**

**USCA10 Civil Case No. 22-6144**

-----  
*Dmt MACTRUONG*, Appellant-Petitioner v.  
*Kevin Stitt, et al.*, Defendants-Appellees  
-----

**PETITIONER *PRO SE*'S  
AFFIRMATION  
IN SUPPORT OF MOTION  
FOR AN ORDER GRANTING PETITIONER *PRO SE*  
LEAVE TO FILE THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF  
CERTIORARI EXCEEDING THE PAGE  
LIMIT REQUIRED BY THE COURT RULE 33.2(b)**

I, Mac Truong, certify under the penalty of perjury as follows:

1. I am the Petitioner *pro se* in the instant Petition for a Writ of Certiorari before this Court against all the Defendants-Appellees herein.
2. I have personal knowledge of and am familiar with all the facts hereinafter related in support of the instant Motion/Application for an order authorizing the submission of Petitioner *pro se's* instant overlength Petition as required by the court rule 33.2(b).

**GROUND TO AUTHORIZE PETITIONER'S  
SUBMISSION OF OVERLENGTH PETITION**

3. The first reason why Petitioner *pro se's* Petition dated March 27, 2023, which should now be filed with the Court, is 68-page long without cover in total, and as such exceeds the required limit by 18 pages, under this Court Rule 33.2(b) is that the instant Petition is in support of Petitioner's Petition for a Writ of Certiorari in this Court to the USCA10 regarding the Oklahoma District Court's false and incorrect Dismissal Order(s) based on two completely fabricated technical ludicrous false and even absurd grounds, to wit (a) The U.S. Copyrights Laws that are conceived to protect and encourage people with great and original ideas to advance civilization do not protect any idea in itself but only the media that the artists use to express their ideas; and (b) Plaintiff-Petitioner, a male living in New Jersey, has no business to be concerned about female citizens living in Oklahoma even though some laws in Oklahoma have been voted and designed cleverly by so-called Trumpist pro-life MAGA misogynist elected legislators to literally murder CBA women by depriving them of urgent and necessary medical services to have safely-induced miscarriages.

4. It is extremely difficult to persuade by a new method of valid reasoning little or unknown so far to this Court in a few words that the District Court and USCA10's opinions are absurd and murderous and must be stricken down by this Court because, even though it is false and absurd, it is anchored deeply on the outdated way of reasoning, which is that of Aristotle's logic of non-contradiction, which asserts that there is an absolute right or an absolute wrong, instead of the newly-discovered true and correct way of reasoning called ABSOLUTE RELATIVITY, which proves beyond a reasonable doubt that every statement made by a human mind is an opinion relatively true and relatively false. **But in this matter the highest and most respected opinion is that of the U.S. Constitution, which the Court has the sacred duty to uphold and not take in a cavalier manner.**

5. As such it takes time and lots more than a few pages to prove that Defendant-Appellee Alito is wrong as a matter of logic and reasoning when he wrote about 100-page *Dobbs v. Jackson* ruling to tell legally illiterate Americans that the issue of whether the American women have a right to abortion is an opinion, that divides the country into three groups: one for, one against and the third no opinion. As such, since SCOTUS, being mostly composed of insufficiently educated members, and unable to decide the issue with good reasoning, must

leave the decision to each State of the U.S.A. to make up their own (unconstitutional and/or illegal) opinions in the matter.

6. The foregoing issue being raised by Appellee Alito can be resolved by the logic of Absolute Relativity as follows. Since every statement is an opinion, the U.S. Constitution, with its 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendments, the 1866 and 1964 Civil Rights Acts, and 1973 *Roe v. Wade* and 2022 Dobbs rulings are all opinions. And since all members of SCOTUS are appointed and sworn in to uphold the U.S. Constitution and federal legislation, which protect the rights of U.S. women to Life, Liberty, Property, Privacy, and the Pursuit of Happiness, this Court must upon Plaintiff-Petitioner's appeal strike down Oklahoma's abortion legislation, and direct all Defendants herein to comply.

7. The second reason why Plaintiff-Petitioner needs to file a long Petition is your affirmant respects the Courts, and must keep the balance between being concise and conclusory, i.e., failing to provide enough evidence or logical explanation in form of undisputed allegations of fact and correct controlling legal authorities before making a proposed conclusion of law. For instance, it does not take long for the Petitioner herein to sum up why Defendant-Appellee Alito is wrong when he has stricken down *Roe v. Wade*, as herein-above mentioned, but your affirmant is sure and certain that the Court would not take my few words for that and let me prevail, and as such, 68 pages won't certainly be long at all to change American and world history by avoiding a second U.S. Civil War and/or WW III, just by universal education and universal partnership, instead of massive bloodshed and violence.

**WHEREFORE** may it please the Court to grant Petitioner-Movant leave to submit my instant Petition in spite of its length; and/or grant all other and further relief set forth in the Notice of Motion, and/or as the Court may deem fair, just, and appropriate in the circumstances.

Dated: April 22, 2023



Dmt MacTruong, Petitioner *pro se*  
875 Bergen Avenue,  
Jersey City, NJ 07306  
(914) 215-2304