

Date
10/20/2023

No. USAP4 No. 23-1203
23-6146

FILED
OCT 20 2023
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

ORIGINAL

Catherine Denise Randolph
(Your Name) — PETITIONER

vs.

Regional management INC, ETAL
— RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

US Court of Appeals 4th circuit
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Catherine Denise Randolph
(Your Name)

9204 Swiven PL Apt 3D
(Address)

Rosedale Maryland 21237
(City, State, Zip Code)

443 635-4746
(Phone Number)

mail
11/16/2023

RECEIVED
NOV 2 2023
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

In RE Catherine Denise Randolph - petitioner
Supreme Court of United States
X Question (s) Presented X

USAP4 NO. 23-1203

11/16/2023
date

- ① What is Anti-Piracy and Infringement?
- ② What is the purpose for the Miller Test to prove Obscenity exist in the State of Maryland?
- ③ What is intentional disclosure with unauthorized surveillance (illegal video drones in the sky)?
1845C2521 1845C2513
What is civil injunction?

Case

USAP4 #23-1203

In RE Catherine Denise Randolph-petitioner
date: 10/20/2023
Supreme Court of the
United States - petition writ
of certiorari

* List of Parties (Respondents
Defendants)

- ① Avery Strachan and Kerrie Smith, Esq
(Defendant: Regional management Inc)
400 East Pratt St 9th Floor
Baltimore, MD 21202
- ② Heather Deane, Esq
(Defendant TJX Inc)
1233 20th St NW, 8th Floor
Washington, DC 20036
- ③ Nicholas Ersoy, Esq
(Tmobile USA - defendant)
1601 K Street, NW Wash, DC 20006
- ④ Thomas Whitford and Stacy Lounsbury, Esq
(Defendant Walgreens Co.)
- ⑤ Jared Green, Esq
(Defendant Medstar Franklin Square
Medical Center.)
One South St. 20th FL Baltimore MD
21202

Case
USAP4 No. 23-1203

In Re Catherine Denise Randolph

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

☒ 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,
☒ is unpublished.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,
☒ is unpublished.

☐ For cases from **state courts**:

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

☐ reported at _____; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

The opinion of the _____ court appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

☐ reported at _____; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

1.

USAP4 No. 23-1203

In Re Catherine Denise Randolph
Case USA 4 No. 23-1203

JURISDICTION

☒ For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was July 27, 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: August 29, 2023, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix A and B 09/06/2023.

☐ An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. A.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1254(1).

☐ For cases from **state courts**:

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

☐ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: _____, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____.

☐ An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. A.

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

Appendix A

FILED: September 6, 2023

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 23-1203
(1:15-mc-00369)

In re: CATHERINE DENISE RANDOLPH

Appellant

M A N D A T E

The judgment of this court, entered July 27, 2023, takes effect today.

This constitutes the formal mandate of this court issued pursuant to Rule
41(a) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.

/s/Nwamaka Anowi, Clerk

CASE USAP4 # 23-1203 Appendix A

Appendix B

FILED: August 29, 2023

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 23-1203
(1:15-mc-00369)

In re: CATHERINE DENISE RANDOLPH

Appellant

ORDER

The court denies the petition for rehearing and rehearing en banc and the supplemental petitions for rehearing and rehearing en banc. No judge requested a poll under Fed. R. App. P. 35 on the petition for rehearing en banc.

Entered at the direction of the panel: Judge Wynn, Judge Heytens, and Senior Judge Floyd.

For the Court

/s/ Patricia S. Connor, Clerk*Appendix B*

*Appendix C**See back
of paper***UNPUBLISHED**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

No. 23-1203

In re: CATHERINE DENISE RANDOLPH,

Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore.
Julie R. Rubin, District Judge. (1:15-mc-00369)

Submitted: July 25, 2023

Decided: July 27, 2023

Before WYNN and HEYTENS, Circuit Judges, and FLOYD, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Catherine Denise Randolph, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

*USAP4 NO. 23-1203**Appendix C*

USPA 4 Case No. 23-1203
U.S. District Court

District of Maryland (Baltimore)

CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 1:15-mc-00369

Apply Rule 28 USC 455

*Enter emergency injunction -
 Outdated with modern
 Technology*

In re Catherine Denise Randolph

Assigned to: Judge Maryland Unassigned - *unethical*

Case in other court: Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, 15-01935

Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, 16-01307

Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, 16-01653

Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, 16-01885

Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, 16-02306

Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, 17-01015

Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, 17-01211

Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, 17-01381

Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, 17-01855

Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, 17-00206

Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, 17-02286

Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, 18-01199

Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, 18-01721

Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, 18-02392

Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, 19-01378

Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, 20-01157

Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, 22-01818

USCA, 23-01203

*Update
 National privacy
 laws to
 ban all
 illegal
 surveillance
 illegal video
 drones
 outside in
 the sky*

In Re

Catherine Denise Randolph

represented by **Catherine Denise Randolph**

9204 Swiven Place Apt. 3D

Rosedale, MD 21237

Email:

PRO SE

Email All Attorneys

Email All Attorneys and Additional Recipients

Date Filed	#	Docket Text
07/10/2015	<u>1</u>	SHOW CAUSE ORDER. Signed by Judge Richard D Bennett on 7/10/2015. (c/m 7/13/15 jnl, Deputy Clerk) (Entered: 07/13/2015)
07/22/2015	<u>2</u>	RESPONSE re <u>1</u> Order to Show Cause filed by Catherine Denise Randolph. (sls, Deputy Clerk) (Entered: 07/22/2015)
07/23/2015	<u>3</u>	MOTION to Amend/Correct <u>2</u> Response by Catherine Denise Randolph Responses due by 8/10/2015 (sls, Deputy Clerk) (Entered: 07/23/2015)

Case USAP4 NO 23-1203 Appendix D

In RE Catherine Denise Randolph
USAP4 Case No. 23-1203

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

1st Amendment Freedom of Press

Enter - 28 USC 455 - Supervisory powers
Rule

Grant Right to Privacy guaranteed to
Stop Unauthorized Surveillance
Violated 4th Amendment
(illegal search)

Apply Federal
Anti-Piracy

Rules of Evidence

Enter Judicial Forfeiture (ban illegal intercept
28 USC 2513
and/or
Enter 18 USC 2521
Civil injunction
Video drones
outside in
the sky)

USAP4 NO. 23-1203

In Re Catherine Denise Randolph
(petitioner)

11/16/2023

USAP4 NO. 23-1203

Supreme court of United States

* Table of Authorities cited *

Case study

- Hulk Hogan v Gawker

- Miller v California

- Smith v US

- Pope v Illinois

* Statutes and Rules

Apply Rules of Evidence

Conduct Miller Test Miller v California

47 USC 605

Unauthorized
publication

or use of
communication

47 USC 553

Anti-Piracy

47 USC 605 3(c)(1+4)

Apply civil injunction
with all penalties

Judicial Forfeiture
18 USC 2513

18 USC 2521

USAP4 #23-1203

In RE Catherine Denise Randolph
11/16/2023 (petitioner)

Supreme court of United States

Case No. USA P4 No. [#]23-1203

* Statement of Case * Cause of action: Ensure Justice Legal Right to privacy

For Good Faith Alliance grant

my Writ of certiorari with

emergency and prohibitory injunction
to ensure equal privacy rights for
my case and with other similar

cases. For example amend Privacy
Rights national Rules to ensure
all illegal surveillance drones (videos ^{sky})

are ban and only used for security
purposes * This is the national
importance for Supreme court to
conduct Miller Test to prove

obscenity publicity with my
name (petitioner) exist in state of
Maryland telecommunication ^(radio) networks.

The lower courts have denied
my petitions without a fair full
litigation court hearing - Defendants
are conducting ^(perjury) misrepresentation: TJX Inc
Walgreens Co, Regional management Inc
T-Mobile USA, Medstar Franklin Square Hospital
or

In RE Catherine Denise Randolph
11/16/2023 (petitioner)

USAP4 No. 23-1203

Supreme Court of United States

Legal Right to Privacy-Stimmel Law

* Reason for Granting the Petition *
^{47 USC 3(e) 1704) 18 USC 2521}
Apply all civil and criminal penalties
to prevent intentional disclosure in the
future with protection for my children (family)

The final decision in the lower courts
conflicts with another appellate court
Supreme court has the Supervisory
competent powers to conduct Miller
test - Rules of Evidence - Appoint experts
to prove obscenity advertising is highly
offensive with petitioner name - Anti-Piracy
Obscenity Criteria - Average persons as well as
myself finds obscene Visual with unauthorized
intercept indirect via private home (bathroom
bedroom and cellphone) lacks serious literary
artistic political or scientific values.

Grant all appropriate civil injunction
relief as soon as possible to prevent
infringement crimes, emotional distress
defamation, punitive damages, deprived
of happiness for no apparent reasons
due to illegal drones outside in the sky
* Consider max compensation ^{up to \$3 billion dollars} for respondents
with penalties to prevent disclosure forever

In Re Catherine Denise Randolph
petitioner
Supreme Court of US

11/16/2023

Case USAP4-23-1203

* Conclusion * The petition for writ (privacy)
of certiorari should be
granted equal rights for all
* The national importance for my
petition is to guaranteed privacy
rights for my family and ban
all unauthorized (obscene) publicity with
my name to prevent future
intentional disclosure (protect my
18 USC 2521 children (family))
Ensure equal civil rights and

Respondents are subject to civil
and criminal penalties since they
did not inform the lower courts
about intentional disclosure with
appropriation of my name for their
personal gain. Respectfully Submitted

Catherine Denise Randolph

Date November 14, 2023



USAP4 NO. 23-1203