

AKB
No. 23-5464

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

PATRICK OKEYO,

Petitioner,

vs.

USCIS, NEWARK OFFICE, SOLICITOR GENERAL OF
THE UNITED STATES, MUUNGANO SDA CHURCH
AND NEW MARANATHA KARIBU SDA CHURCH c/o,
ALLEGHENY EAST CONFERENCE OF SEVENTH-DAY
ADVENTIST, MATTHEW N. KLEBANOFF, HELENA P.
MEHTA & BRIAN M. SEARLS, JOHN SANDERCOCK &
PAUL M. TARR, NEW BRUNSWICK SDA CHURCH,

Respondents.

On Petition For Writ Of Certiorari
To The United States Court Of Appeals
For The Third Circuit

PETITION FOR REHEARING

PATRICK L. OKEYO
50 Grove Place, 3rd Floor
East Orange, NJ 07017
Phone #551-208-8088

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE CONTENTS	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
CERTIFICATE OF THE APPELLANT	1
REASONS FOR GRANTING REHEARING	2
CLOSING REMARKS.....	8
CERTIFICATE OF GOOD FAITH.....	10

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
CASES	
<i>Black v. Aegis Consumer Funding Group, Inc.</i> , 2001 U.S. Dist. Lexis 2632 (S.D. Ala. Feb. 8, 2001)	7
<i>Boyd v. United States</i> , 116 U.S. 616 (1886)	2
<i>Byars v. U.S.</i> , 273 U.S. 28 (1927)	2
<i>Douglass v. Hustler Magazine</i> , 769 F.2d 1128 (7th Cir. 1985).....	7
<i>Huskey v. National Broadcasting Co.</i> , 632 F. Supp. 1282 (N.D. Ill. 1986)	2
<i>Jackson v. Playboy Enterprises, Inc.</i> , 574 F. Supp. 10 (S.D. Ohio 1983)	2
<i>Martin v. Municipal Publications</i> , 510 F. Supp. 255 (E.D. Pa. 1981).....	7
<i>McBriety v. Baltimore</i> , 219 Md. 223 (Md. 1959)	2
<i>Strutner v. Dispatch Printing Co.</i> , 2 Ohio App. 3d 377 (Ohio Ct. App., Franklin County 1982)	7
<i>Trevino v. Southwestern Bell Tel. Co.</i> , 582 S.W.2d 582 (Tex. Civ. App. Corpus Christi 1979)	7
<i>United States v. Guest</i> , 383 U.S. 745 (1966)	7
<i>Zacchini v. Scripps-Howard Broadcasting Co.</i> , 433 U.S. 562 (1977)	7
CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS	
U.S. Const. amend. I	3, 8
U.S. Const. amend. IV.....	2, 3

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

	Page
U.S. Const. amend. V	3
U.S. Const. amend. IX.....	3
U.S. Const. amend. XIII.....	1
U.S. Const. amend. XIV	3, 4, 6
 STATUTES	
18 U.S. Code §241	3, 4
18 U.S. Code §242	4
18 U.S. Code §1028	7
18 U.S. Code §1038	3
26 U.S. Code §24	4
42 U.S. Code §3631	3
 RULES	
Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 12(6).....	7
Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 12(A)(I)(B)(C).....	7
Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 44	1
 OTHER AUTHORITIES	
Magna Carta Article 39 (1215).....	7

CERTIFICATE OF THE APPELLANT

Pursuant to Federal Rule 44, the appellant, Patrick L. Okeyo, is petitioning for rehearing of US Supreme Court's Order on 01/08/2024 doc. #23-5464 denying his petition for writ of certiorari. This petition is to request the court to reconsider the decision it made. The appellant is seeking eligibility for relief for all abuses and drama placed on him, for depriving his life, time wasted, defamation, and resources wasted; further vacate the investigating file. Investigations took over 26 years as evidenced through written daily journal; the appellant is praying to the court to grant a chance for rehearing. When the court declines the case, it means the court is accepting for the investigations to continue. The appellant places responsibility on opposing counsel and wishes for the judicial discretion of the court. The Appellant has carried a burden that he doesn't deserve to have by living a limited and controlled life like a modern slave in violation of the 13th Amendment. Being punished for a crime he never committed. Rehearing the case and accepting it to proceed will allow the investigating file vacated.

The appellant is author of "Overview of The Gospel of St. Luke". He works for special needs for the ARC of Hunterdon County New Jersey. The appellant has never abandoned any of USCIS applications when he made application of change of status. The appellant never abandoned settlement of the civil case he filed at Hudson County Court, and he never received any mail of the settlement.

I the appellant, the information given is true to the best of my knowledge and I understand the consequences of being untruthful.

Sincerely,

Patrick L Okeyo
50 Grove Place, 3rd Floor
East Orange, NJ 07017
Phone #551-208-8088

REASONS FOR GRANTING REHEARING

There's clear evidence that in 26 years of investigation, surveillance and circulating the appellant's name, the authorities had all the necessary resources to arrest, prosecute and jail than abuse.

The house was searched without a court Order, *Boyd v. United States*, 116 U.S. 616 (1886), *Byars v. U.S.*, 273 U.S. 28, 32 (1927), in violation of 4th Amendment invasion of privacy *Huskey v. National Broadcasting Co.*, 632 F. Supp. 1282 (N.D. III. 1986), *Jackson v. Playboy Enterprises, Inc.*, 574 F. Supp. 10 (S.D. Ohio 1983), creating publicity unreasonably puts the other in false light "*McBriety v. Baltimore*," 219 Md. 223 (Md. 1959). The right of people to be secure in their homes page7.

Reconsider rehearing to vacate Alien #99-157-853 from the appellant's immigration file which they have used to investigate and mentally torture him page 1-2,

excessively frustrated the appellant that made him depressed.

Reconsider to rehear on New Jersey unemployment agency (department of labor) arrears contributed and his escrow from a trucking company and another trucking company cancelling a contract in violation of the contract without notice page 2. "Equal employment Opportunity."

Reconsider rehearing the case for gross violation of freedom of worship in some churches for being chased out and humiliated in violation of 1st amendment "peaceful assembly" it's against the constitution for misleading information and hoaxes – 18 U.S. Code §1038 page8-13.

While at work passengers physically assaulted the appellant on Lyft Rideshare service dispatch community and Lyft refused to give police their information page 2, which is unconstitutional, beating and intimidation is against 42 U.S. Code §3631, 18 U.S. Code §241. The Court should rehear and stop these habitual abuses.

Reconsider rehearing so that the COURT can use her authority to deactivate and vacate the investigating file from Hudson County prosecutor's office and immigration page3 who are using churches to circulate defamation.

The court should reconsider rehearing the case and enforce 1st, 4th, 5th, 9th, and 14th Amendments page4-5. Read pg5 #8

Reconsider rehearing the case because of double standard on IRS TAX CHILD CREDIT exception that was not given when he raised his children Alfred and Obed, child credit exception 26 U.S. Code §24; In violation of 18 U.S. Code §242 and §241 against rights. Every citizen who works and pays taxes and have children are entitled to IRS TAX Child credit exception. Is it because the appellant is an African to be investigated for the entire life in USA and sabotage his finances?

Reconsider rehearing the case because USCIS has hidden motives which the court has to vacate and restrain. The appellant was arrested in April 24, 2002 the arrest warrant issued on October 23rd, 1998, put in detention in El Paso Texas; the case was terminated on 04/19/2005. Since then, it's just investigations until today, this is a human being not an African monkey; placing an alien number which is not his A99-157-853 destined for harassment in violation of the 14th Amendment.

Reconsider rehearing the case, because Linden Police in their police report indicated that the minor assaulted the appellant, when the child never even entered the car, his father did assault the appellant. Also, Harrison police instead of giving a precise Police report as by CCTV, they contradicted the CCTV because the appellant was under investigation. US Supreme Court has to remove all these conspiracies from the appellant's life page13-14. These shows the color matters in enforcement and judiciary which promotes unfair legal

decisions; like that accident it was never caused by the appellant.

Reconsider rehearing the case because immigration alleged that the application was untimely filed Third circuit file #13-3519 when it was timely filed with insufficient funds in counsellor's account. The disciplinary complaint was filed with New York Appellant Division of Disciplinary and was granted. USCIS set interview for Nairobi-06Feb2011 confirmation number NRB2011832024 from the 1996 Green card lottery they alleged visas were not available-this time it was available and at the same time voluntary departure by Judge Roger Harris was set by April 12th, 2011. LET THE NINE JUSTICES LOOK AT THIS SCHEDULING. (In 1996 Green card lottery the appellant paid all costs that was required and the lawyer, only to be told there was no visa available). The settlement that was not given to the Appellant is the one they wanted to take and put the appellant on endless investigations page18. If the appellant had gone out of the country, he was not going to come back. The US supreme court has to vacate that investigating file by rehearing the case.

Reconsider rehearing the file because of assault that happened at place of work (car) while with Lyft rideshare passengers all of them 911 was called, Jersey City incident report #210351, Union New Jersey report #19-7391 and Linden incident report #19012057, Harrison car accident report #16-00885 page19, the appellant paid high insurance premium for being innocent. Lyft refused to provide information to police for arrest.

Reconsider rehearing the case because when the appellant went to court for a civil matter against unemployment department (labor); the case was determined in Ocean County Courthouse instead of Hudson County Court where it was filed. The appellant was not informed the fact that he filed at Hudson County Courthouse, the ruling declined to award him unemployment arrears 14th Amendment, the fact that deduction was made.

Reconsider to rehear the case since an immigrant cannot have two Alien numbers the court has to rule for the appellant to keep his clean Alien number page23.

Reconsider rehearing the case since the complaint was done in 2004 with New Jersey Safety Department with detective Josep Trap and Paterson #CJ-2004-00839 page25 for stalking the appellant, endless harassment, defamation, slander and calling places he went to deliver and pick up loads. Excessive extension of cases, interviews, financial exploitation, and exhaustion crossing 14th Amendment. As an immigrant the appellant was not able under the law of fear to take USCIS and Hudson County Prosecutor to court before he received his papers that took 26 years.

Reconsider rehearing the case because their assumption investigation has demoralized the appellant and tainted his face image; (a) the appellant is not; a terrorist, (b) a Muslim and (c) a Middle Eastern – Vacate the investigating file page25. Deactivate the investigations to allow the appellant travel home. That's

why the court should know they kept the settlement belonging to the appellant and engage him with improvised investigations to keep the settlement because he is an African cow to be milked.

Reconsider rehearing because: *United States v. Guest*, 383 U.S. 745 (1966). Complaints were never responded to under Federal Civil Rule 12(A)(I)(B)(C) and 12(6) pages27-29.

Reconsider and rehear the case to solve and clear appellant name; Identity Theft and assumption Deterrence Act 18 U.S. Code §1028 and the right to privacy *Strutner v. Dispatch Printing Co.*, 2 Ohio App. 3d 377 (Ohio Ct. App., Franklin County 1982). *Black v. Aegis Consumer Funding Group, Inc.*, 2001 U.S. Dist. Lexis 2632 (S.D. Ala. Feb. 8, 2001) page31. *Zacchini v. Scripps-Howard Broadcasting Co.*, 433 U.S. 562, 572 (1977). *Trevino v. Southwestern Bell Tel. Co.*, 582 S.W.2d 582 (Tex. Civ. App. Corpus Christi 1979). *Douglass v. Hustler Magazine*, 769 F.2d 1128 (7th Cir. 1985); *Martin v. Municipal Publications*, 510 F. Supp. 255 (E.D. Pa. 1981). Magna Carta Article 39 (1215). Appellant's name was circulated at U.S. Navy Surveillance unit for no reason.

Reconsider and rehear the Divorce Decree as tabled at Third Circuit Court of Appeal DC #13-3519 Page 000339-000345. USCIS used the document to torture and abuse the appellant for no ground. USCIS is not above the law neither should the court cover their mess since there's independence and separation between the two, legislature and judiciary. USCIS cannot

dictate documents of another independent country injuring the appellant without legitimacy for 26 years. The appellant is not an African black cow to be milked over the years.

CLOSING REMARKS OF THE APPELLANT

The court is requested to reconsider and rehear the case since the appellant's freedom is compromised with immerse humiliations. USCIS fake Alien #99-157-853 used to frustrate livelihood of an immigrate illegitimately has to be removed, investigation vacated and closed. The scenario of this abuse is centered on grabbing the appellant's money or income to drain him economically and sabotage his finance. His unemployment arrears were not paid to him which was conspired with USCIS to deny him Work Authorization and donate those money to welfare, his farmers Insurance accident money was sabotage of his earning and life for what he never caused as by CCTV at the traffic light. Any human being in the United States of America is given Child Credit Tax Exempt why not the appellant when his children came 5 & 7 years old, instead he was taken to IRS TAX COURT. He was not given his escrow by a trucking company he made a contract with and yet another trucking company cancelled the contract without 21 days' notice. Freedom of worship as by 1st Amendment of the appellant's worship was violated chased out of churches instead of using law enforcement if the law was violated. The appellant was arrested on April 24 2002 and detained, then the case

was terminated in 2005, he was not given his papers until courts after courts until 2019. There's no compelling reason USCIS was torturing the appellant. In 1996, the appellant won his greens card lottery, he paid all required fees and fines on application, but he was told that there was no visa. His MONEY was not refunded USCIS kept it (Financial Sabotage). The appellant was beaten at his work (Lyft) and no step was taken since it was a campaign to humiliate him and assault him. Authorities (Jersey City Police, City Hall Jersey City, Hudson County Prosecutor's office, Hudson County Clerk's office, New York City Police Department, and some) failed to answer summons mailed to them totally. The Appellant filed a complaint with the state in 2004 #CJ-2004-00839. USCIS is not supposed to decide which documents to accept when issued by another government from 1993-2019 on charge of status application; it was used in Third Circuit Court file number and page DC #13-3519 Page 000339-000345. All their mails USCIS was sending that time were not received by the appellant. The appellant did not abandon any application nor settlement from his civil case; it's taking advantage.

My Ladyship and Lordship I pray that I get my justice today.

Respectfully submitted,

PATRICK L. OKEYO
50 Grove Place, 3rd Floor
East Orange, NJ 07017
Phone #551-208-8088

CERTIFICATE OF GOOD FAITH

The undersigned hereby certifies that this Petition for Rehearing is restricted to the grounds specified in Rule 44.2 of the Rules of the Supreme Court and is presented in good faith and not for delay.

PATRICK L. OKEYO
50 Grove Place, 3rd Floor
East Orange, NJ 07017
Phone #551-208-8088