

No. _____

(23A355)

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Martin Akerman, Pro Se

_____ — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.
Nevada National Guard

_____ — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

THE SUPREME COURT OF NEVADA

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

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Martin Akeman, Pro Se, In Forma Pauperis

(Your Name)

2001 North Adams Street, Unit 440

(Address)

Arlington, Virginia, 22201

(City, State, Zip Code)

(202) 656 - 5601

(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1. Jurisdictional Question: Whether the Nevada Supreme Court made an error in naming the Nevada National Guard as the sole respondent in a habeas corpus petition, depriving the Petitioner of a means of contesting the lawfulness of his restraint and securing his release.
2. Constitutional Rights and Military Jurisdiction: Whether Brigadier General Garduno's actions violated the petitioner's constitutional rights to due process, under civilian legal standards.
3. Detention and Due Process under Federal Law: Whether the petitioner's detention and the inability to challenge the foundational facts of the alleged criminal proceedings, contravene the due process guarantees of the constitution of the United States, especially in light of the statutory protections codified by Congress.

LIST OF PARTIES

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

☒ 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:

The following parties to the proceeding are missing from the caption of the case within the meaning of Rule 14.1(b)(i):

- Nevada Air National Guard, Brigadier General, Caesar Garduno
- State of Nevada, Adjutant General, Ondra L. Berry
- State of Nevada Attorney General

The undersigned affirms that no party is a nongovernmental corporation, Rule 29.6.

RELATED CASES

- The United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces reviewed a related Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus and Appeal, under Article 70, UCMJ, which was denied and not allowed to proceed by the Judge Advocate General of the Air Force, on August 24, 2023. (Appendix C)
- In the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus has been filed under Case No. 23-5230. This is the lead case, encompassing challenges under No. 23-1268, against the designation of the Petitioner as an Enemy Combatant, and No. 23-5229, contesting an alleged conviction. A related Freedom of Information Act Case, No. 23-cv-2574, is currently being heard in the District Court for the District of Columbia.
- A separate Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus has been lodged in the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, bearing Case No. 23-2046.

RELATED CASES CONTINUED
COLLATERAL CASES PURSUANT TO RULE 14.1(B)(III)

- An appeal is ongoing in the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, under Case No. 22-2066. This is a significant case under the Collateral Order Doctrine, integrating two final orders from the Eastern District of Virginia (EDVA), specifically Case Nos. 22-cv-696 and 22-cv-1258.
- The Supreme Court of Virginia is presently hearing an appeal under Case No. 230670. This leading case addresses a Breach of Legal Insurance, a matter connected to the aforementioned habeas proceedings. It consolidates related cases from the Arlington Circuit Court, the Virginia Court of Appeals, and the State Corporation Commission.
- Lastly, an appeal in the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, under Case No. 23-2216, seeks to review the application of 50 U.S. Code § 3341(j)(8) to the Civil Service Reform Act (CSRA).

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
Gerstein v. Pugh, 420 U.S. 103 (1975).....	5 , 7
Hensley v. Municipal Ct., 411 U.S. 351 (1973).....	4
Jones v. Cunningham, 371 U.S. 236 (1963).....	4
Lambert v. McFarland, 612 F. Supp. 1252 (N.D. Ga. 1985).....	5 , 7
Printz v. United States, 521 U.S. 898 (1997).....	4 , 6
Rippo v. Baker, 137 S. Ct. 905 (2017).....	4 , 6

STATUTES AND RULES

5 U.S. Code § 6329b.....	3
5 U.S. Code § 7513.....	3
5 U.S. Code § 7513(b)(1).....	3
5 U.S. Code § 7532.....	3
28 U.S.C. § 1251.....	2
28 U.S.C. § 1257(a).....	2
28 U.S.C. § 1259.....	2
28 U.S.C. § 2241.....	3
28 U.S.C. § 2254.....	4 , 6

OTHER

Article I, Section 9, Clause 2, U.S. Constitution.....	3 , 4 , 6
First Amendment, U.S. Constitution.....	4 , 6
Fourth Amendment, U.S. Constitution.....	5 , 6
Federalist No. 84, Alexander Hamilton.....	3 , 6

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	4
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	6
CONCLUSION.....	7

INDEX TO APPENDICES

Order: Supreme Court of Nevada, June 2, 2023

APPENDIX A

Petition for Rehearing Denied, July 12, 2023

APPENDIX B

Letter: Judge Advocate General of the Air Force, August 24, 2023

APPENDIX C

Extension 23A355 Granted: Justice Kagan

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

1.

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 _____ 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 _____ 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 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 _____ 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.

2.

JURISDICTION

☐ For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was _____.

☐ 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. ____ 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 June 2, 2023.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix ____ A ____.

☒ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date:
July 12, 2023, and a copy of the order denying rehearing
appears at Appendix ____ B ____.

☒ An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted
to and including November 23, 2023 (date) on October 24, 2023 (date) in
Application No. 23 355 (Appendix D) ____ A ____.

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

The jurisdiction of this court is potentially invoked under 28 U.S. Code § 1259, where the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces reviewed a related Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus and Appeal, under Article 70, UCMJ, which was denied and not allowed to proceed by the Judge Advocate General of the Air Force, on August 24, 2023. (Appendix C)

The jurisdiction of this court may be invoked under 28 U.S. Code § 1251.

3.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

*"To bereave a man of life or by violence to confiscate his estate, without accusation or trial, would be so gross and notorious an act of despotism, as must at once convey the alarm of tyranny throughout the whole nation; but confinement of the person, by secretly hurrying him to jail, where his sufferings are unknown or forgotten, is a less public, a less striking, and therefore A MORE DANGEROUS ENGINE of arbitrary government."*¹

Jurisdictional Question: This element addresses the potential for despotism in the procedural handling of habeas corpus petitions. The specific concern is the appropriateness of naming the Nevada National Guard as the sole respondent, given the military context and the potential for sovereign immunity, which could obscure the petitioner's ability to challenge their detention.

Constitutional Rights and Military Jurisdiction: Hamilton's fear of tyranny is echoed in the potential violation of constitutional rights to due process under civilian legal standards. The case questions whether Brigadier General Garduno's actions infringed upon these rights, as protected under Article I, Section 9, Clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution. (habeas corpus)

Detention and Due Process under Federal Law: Reflecting Hamilton's concern about the dangers of secret detentions, this section examines the petitioner's confinement under 5 U.S. Code § 6329b and suspension 5 U.S. Code § 7513. It highlights the crucial role of due process, including the suspension of due process under 5 U.S. Code § 7513(b)(1), its distinction from 5 U.S. Code § 7532, and the suspension of habeas corpus for aliens labeled as enemy combatants, a critical balance between individual rights and national security, 28 U.S. Code § 2241(e).

¹ Alexander Hamilton, Federalist 84

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The habeas corpus petition, urgently filed, stands out among ongoing legal actions due to its focus on the immediate effects on the petitioner's liberty and tenured federal employment, a recognized property interest. It challenges the conditions of detention and potential career jeopardy, seeking prompt relief distinct from gradual appellate procedures in other courts. This contrasts with the appeals in the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit (Case No. 22-2066) and related cases, which do not directly address these immediate concerns of liberty and property rights, as delineated in *Hensley v. Municipal Ct.*, 411 U.S. 351 (1973), and *Jones v. Cunningham*, 371 U.S. 236 (1963).

The Jurisdictional Question, informed by 28 U.S.C. § 2254, underscores procedural fairness issues, particularly the necessity of properly identifying respondents in habeas cases. The exclusive naming of the Nevada National Guard, without including other responsible state entities like the attorney general, raises concerns about the petitioner's ability to effectively challenge their detention, especially given the military context and potential for sovereign immunity. This situation also touches upon the First Amendment's guarantee of the right to petition the government for a redress of grievances. In this context, the petitioner's ability to seek redress through habeas corpus is a fundamental aspect of this constitutional right, emphasizing the importance of correctly identifying all relevant parties in the case.

The actions of Brigadier General Garduno, especially concerning the alleged illegal use of the State National Guard by the Federal Government, invoke critical constitutional considerations. This aspect of the case seems overlooked in the Panel's Opinion, failing to consider the foundational balance of power principles and constitutional safeguards of liberty and property, as established in *Printz v. United States*, 521 U.S. 898 (1997), and addressed in *Rippo v. Baker*, 137 S. Ct. 905 (2017).

STATEMENT OF THE CASE CONTINUED

General Garduno's actions, in confining the petitioner without adequate due process or procedural safeguards and overstepping his authority, are at odds with the separation of powers doctrine. The petitioner's ongoing false arrest since February 14, 2022, without a crime charge, intensifies the constitutional violation, necessitating a judicial determination of probable cause as per *Gerstein v. Pugh*, 420 U.S. 103 (1975), and *Lambert v. McFarland*, 612 F. Supp. 1252 (N.D. Ga. 1985). This emphasizes the need for adherence to Fourth Amendment protections and the urgency of redressing the harm caused to the petitioner.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

This petition for habeas corpus, grounded in the principles articulated by Hamilton and enshrined in the Constitution, raises crucial questions about the balance of power, individual rights, and procedural justice. It underscores the potential for despotism in the procedural handling of habeas corpus petitions and calls into question the actions of military officials in their exercise of civilian legal standards. The case's significance is further highlighted by its potential conflict with state and federal law, as well as existing legal precedents. Addressing these concerns, particularly the petitioner's rights under First and Fourth Amendment protections, is not only urgent but paramount to maintaining the constitutional balance of liberty and authority. This petition, therefore, presents an essential opportunity for judicial scrutiny and redress, reinforcing the indispensable role of habeas corpus in safeguarding individual freedoms against arbitrary government actions.

I. THE DECISIONS BELOW CONFLICT WITH STATE AND FEDERAL LAW

The Nevada Supreme Court's decision to name the Nevada National Guard as the sole respondent conflicts with state and federal law, particularly 28 U.S.C. § 2254, which emphasizes the importance of correctly identifying respondents in habeas cases. This misstep potentially obstructs the petitioner's ability to contest their detention, given the military context and sovereign immunity issues.

II. THE DECISIONS BELOW CONFLICT WITH THIS COURT'S PRECEDENT

The decision conflicts with this Court's precedent in cases like *Printz v. United States* and *Rippo v. Baker*, which underscore the importance of maintaining a balance of powers and upholding constitutional safeguards of liberty and property.

III. THE QUESTIONS PRESENTED ARE EXCEPTIONALLY IMPORTANT

The petition presents critical questions regarding the violation of constitutional rights under civilian legal standards by military officials and the suspension of habeas

corpus for individuals labeled as enemy combatants. These issues bear significant implications for individual rights and national security.


IV. THIS CASE IS AN IDEAL VEHICLE

This case provides an ideal vehicle to address these significant legal issues due to the clear demonstration of constitutional violations, including the lack of due process in the petitioner's confinement and the necessity of a judicial determination of probable cause, as mandated by *Gerstein v. Pugh* and *Lambert v. McFarland*. It is a compelling example of the urgent need for adherence to Fourth Amendment protections.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: NOVEMBER 14, 2023

County/City of Arlington
 Commonwealth/State of VA
 The foregoing instrument was acknowledged
 before me this 14th day of November
2023 by Martin Akerman
 (name of person seeking acknowledgement)
 Notary Public
 My Commission Expires: 09/30/2026

