

No.

23-6671

ORIGINAL

FILED

JAN 18 2024

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Raymond A. Ford, Jr. — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

Ralph Norstrom, et. al. — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Raymond A. Ford, Jr. #1187664
(Your Name)

COLO SPRINGS CORRECTIONAL UNIT
221 SPITLER CIRCLE
(Address)

GREENVILLE, VIRGINIA 24440
(City, State, Zip Code)

(540) 337-1818
(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

- 1) HOW ARE PRO SE PRISONER CASES TO BE DECIDED BY THE FEDERAL COURTS?
- 2) IS THE COVID-19 "VACCINE" ACTUALLY A BIOLOGICAL WEAPON OF MASS DESTRUCTION?

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:

*RALPH NORTON; GLENN YOUNGKIN; HAROLD CLARKE;
KEMSY BOWLES; KIMBERLY SOUTER; S. RUIZ;
GEORGE WALKER; ASHLYN HARTSOOK; NICK MEYER;
AND S. MOE-WILLIS.*

RELATED CASES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	4
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	26
CONCLUSION.....	35

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	<i>UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT DECISION</i>
APPENDIX B	<i>UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA DECISION</i>
APPENDIX C	<i>UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS REVERSING AND REHEARING EN BANC DECISION</i>
APPENDIX D	
APPENDIX E	
APPENDIX F	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
<i>BELL ATL. CORP. v. TWOMBLY</i> , 550 U.S. 544, 570, 127 S.Ct. 1955, 167 LEd.2d 929 (2009)	27
<i>BROWN v. WHOLE FOODS MKT. GRP. INC.</i> , 789 F.3d 146, 152 (D.C.Cir. 2005)	27
<i>FORD v. NORTHAM</i> , 2023 WL 2767780, 2023 U.S. DIST. LEXIS 56552	1
<i>FORD v. NORTHAM</i> , RECORD NO. 23-6410	1, 20
 STATUTES AND RULES	
18 U.S.C., SECTION 178 (1)(A)	33
18 U.S.C., SECTION 178 (1)-(3)	33
18 U.S.C., SECTION 2382 (a)	33
28 U.S.C., SECTION 1254 (1)	2
42 U.S.C., SECTION 1983	20
RULE 15 OF THE FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE	30
 OTHER	
<i>COST IN THE SUPERMARKET: FEDERAL TERRORISM FOR COUGHING COVID</i> , 27 WIDENER L. REV. 177, 179-82 (2021)	32

CASES (CONT.)

PAGE NUMBER

GILL V. TBG FOOD ACQUISITION CORP.,

2020 U.S. DIST. LEXIS 120655 *1-2

(W.D. Va. JULY 9, 2020)

26-27

GARDON V. ENGLAND, 354 F. APP'X 975,

981-82 (6th Cir. 2009)

30

LEWIS V. MAUSKOPF, 2022 U.S. DIST.

LEXIS 201820 *67 (D.C. DIST. 2022)

27, 29

RICHARDSON V. UNITED STATES, 193 F.3d

545, 548, 338 U.S. APP. D.C. 265

(D.C. Cir. 1999)

27, 29

S. WALK AT BRANDLON'S HOMEOWNERS'

ASS'N V. OPEN BRAND AT BRANDLON'S,

LLC, 713 F.3d 175, 184-85

(4th Cir. 2013)

23, 27, 30

TOLLIVER V. NOBLE, 752 FED APP'X. 254,

266 (6th Cir. 2018)

27, 29

OTHER (CONT.)

PRISON LITIGATION REFORM ACT

31

SMOLDOX, GENETIC ENGINEERING, AND

BIO-TERRORISM, 62 MD. L. REV. 417,

428, 430-31, 487-90, NN. 78, 88, 92,

413-16, 421 AND PG. 490 N. 431 (2003)

34

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 2023 WL 2767780
2023 U.S. DIST. LEXIS 56552; or,

☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,

☐ is unpublished.

☐ For cases from **state courts**: N/A

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.

JURISDICTION

☒ For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was SEPTEMBER 18, 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: OCTOBER 23, 2023, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix C.

☐ 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**: N/A

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).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

THE PROVISIONS INVOLVED ARE LENGTHY. IN THE
INTEREST OF BREVITY AND JUDICIAL ECONOMY, THESE
PROVISIONS APPEAR HEREIN AS LISTED IN APPENDIX
B, PGS. 6-7, AND ARE DISCUSSED THROUGHOUT
APPENDIX B, PAGE 1-38.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

THIS CASE CONCERNS THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COVID-19 "VACCINE," WHICH, ACCORDING TO PLAINTIFF, IS A PUBLICLY-FUNDED BIOLOGICAL WEAPON OF MASS DESTRUCTION (WMD OR BWMD) THAT ACTUALLY CAUSES COVID-19 AND PROMOTES MUTATIONS OF COVID-19.

AS THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA EXPLAINED IN ITS MEMORANDUM OPINION,

MOST OF FORD'S CLAIMS ARE BASED ON HIS OVERARCHING THEORY THAT THE MITIGATION MEASURES USED BY THE GOVERNOR AND VDOC OFFICIALS TO CONTROL THE SPREAD OF COVID-19, AND PARTICULARLY THEIR MAKING VACCINES AVAILABLE TO HIM AND OTHER INMATES,

HE STATES THAT THE "NEW NORMAL"
IMPLEMENTED BY VDOC AFTER THE VACCINE
BECAME AVAILABLE VIOLATED HIS CONSTITUTIONAL
RIGHTS BY REQUIRING THAT HE BE

"FULLY" "VACCINATED" WITH A COVID-19
"VACCINE," WHICH, ACCORDING TO PLAINTIFF,
IS A PUBLICLY-FUNDED BIOLOGICAL WEAPON
OF MASS DESTRUCTION (WMD OR BWMD)
THAT ACTUALLY CAUSES COVID-19 AND PROMOTES
MUTATIONS OF COVID-19.

(SEE APPENDIX B, MEMORANDUM OPINION, PG. 2).

IN THE CIVIL ACTION COMPLAINT FILED BY
PLAINTIFF, PPD 85, A PRISONER IN THE VIRGINIA
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS (VDOC) AT COTTAGEWOOD
CORRECTIONAL CENTER (CWCC), ON MARCH 9, 2022,
PLAINTIFF PRESENTED THAT THE SO-CALLED COVID-19
"VACCINE" IS NOT ACTUALLY A VACCINE, BUT IS A

BWMO. (PL's Comp., AT PIP 71-145). IN ORDER TO
MAKE THE SO-CALLED "VACCINES," SCIENTISTS TAKE
THE DEADLY SPIKE PROTEIN OF THE CORONAVIRUS
SARS-COV-2 AND ITS MANY MUTATIONS - WHICH HAD
BEEN PREVIOUSLY AMPLIFIED IN A PROCESS CALLED
"GAIN-OF-FUNCTION," EXTRAPOLATE THE GENETIC
SEQUENCE, AND THEN SEND AN INSTRUCTION TO
THE HUMAN BODY'S HEALTHY CELLS THROUGH EITHER
mRNA OR A VIRAL-VECTOR TO SELF-PRODUCE
THE DEADLY SPIKE PROTEIN OF COVID-19. (PL's
Comp., PIP 18-19, 62-64, 74, 93, 99, 175-175
(Xvi) : AS NOTED IN THE COMPLAINT : NO "OFF-SWITCH"
IS DESCRIBED; SELF-PRODUCTION TO WHAT END?

OVERWHELMING THE SYSTEM AND SITTING TO OTHERS?

ALL REFERENCES MADE TO THE "VACCINE" THROUGHOUT THIS COMPLAINT RELATE TO PLAINTIFF'S ALLEGATION THAT THE COVID-19 "VACCINE" IS ACTUALLY A BLINDO, AND THE "VACCINE" IS ONLY A SO-CALLED "VACCINE" - WHICH IS WHY IT ALWAYS APPEARS IN QUOTATION MARKS.

THUSLY, ACCORDING TO PLAINTIFF, NO TRUE COVID-19 VACCINE EXISTS BECAUSE COVID-19 INFECTION ORIGINATES FROM THE BLINDO "VACCINE" ITSELF AND IS SPREAD TO OTHERS PRIMARILY BY THOSE WHO WERE INJECTED WITH THE BLINDO COVID-19 "VACCINE."

THUSLY, FORD FILED SUIT AGAINST THE FORMER
AND CURRENT GOVERNORS OF VIRGINIA (RAUPH NORTON
AND GLENN YOUNGKIN), VDOC'S DIRECTOR HAROLD CLARKE,
KIMBY BOWLES (THE WARDEN OF CWCC), REGIONAL
OMBUDSMAN S. MOE-WILLIS, AND FIVE DEFENDANTS
WHO WORK AT CWCC, WHERE FORD WAS HOUSED AT
ALL TIMES RELEVANT TO THE COMPLAINT.

FORD FURTHER ASSERTED THAT HE HAS "NUMEROUS
REASONS FOR OBJECTING" TO THE VACCINE AND DOES NOT
WANT IT. THESE INCLUDE THAT HE CONTRACTED COVID-19
IN LATE 2020, AND HE HAS "NATURAL IMMUNITY,"
AS WELL AS HIS CONCERNS ABOUT THE VACCINE'S
SAFETY AND EFFECTIVENESS. HE SUGGESTED THAT

"By mandating and infecting PLAINTIF, OTHER VDOC
PRISONERS AND STAFF WITH THIS BLIND, DEFENDANTS
ARE ENGAGED IN A PRACTICE OF GENOCIDE, AS WELL AS
STATE-SPONSORED MUNICHHAUSEN SYNDROME BY PROXY"
BECAUSE EXTENSIVE USE OF VACCINES IS PROLONGING
COVID INFECTIONS AND SICKNESS. RELATEDLY, HE
CONTENDED THAT WHEN THE VACCINE WAS RELEASED,
THE VDOC POLICIES IMPLEMENTING THE "NEW
NORMAL" WERE "ACTS OF BOTH SECESSION AND
TREASON". (PL's Comp., pgs. 7-8).

AFTER SETTING FORTH HIS BASIC THEORY OF THE
CASE IN THE COMPLAINT'S "INTRODUCTION", FORD DEVOTED
MANY PAGES TO EXPLAINING WHAT A CORONAVIRUS IS,

WITH BOTH COVID-19 AND ITS VACCINES ARE WINDS OR
BLOODS, SETTING FORTH A HISTORY OF THE PANDEMIC
AND THE U.S. RESPONSE TO IT, INCLUDING AN ALLEGED
"COVER UP" RELATED TO THE RELEASE OF THE
COVID-19 VIRUS, EXPLAINING PARTS OF THE VACCINE,
AND DESCRIBING HOW AND WHY IT HAS BEEN
"WEAPONIZED." (PL's Comp., AT 10-41). HE ALSO
INCLUDED A SECTION EXPLAINING THE HISTORY OF
U.S. "MUNCHAUSEN SYNDROME BY PROXY." (ID., AT
41-46). HE THEN DISCUSSED WHY HE BELIEVES
NATURAL IMMUNITY IS SUPERIOR IN STRENGTH TO
THE VACCINES, THE "QUESTIONABLE" EFFICACY OF
COVID VACCINES, HOW THE BOOSTER SHOTS AFFECT

ANTIBODY LEVELS, AND HOW THE VACCINES ARE CONTRIBUTING TO THE INFECTION RATE. (Id., at 47-53).

NEXT, BEGINNING ON PAGE 54 OF HIS COMPLAINT, FORD BEGAN TO DISCUSS COVID-19 RELATED EVENTS THAT OCCURRED WITHIN VDOC OR AT CWCC. HE EXPLAINED THAT HE HAD WORKED AT THE LAW LIBRARY AT CWCC SINCE 2018, AND HE HAD WORKED HARD TO ENSURE THAT THE LAW LIBRARY REMAINED A "COVID-FREE ZONE." (Id., at 54).

IN "LATE 2020," VDOC AND CWCC OFFICIALS "OFFERED - WITH INCENTIVE FOR THE FIRST TIME - A 'FLU SHOT.'" (Id., at 55). AFTER OTHER PRAISES

RECEIVED THIS SHOT, AND STAFF AND PRISONERS

MINGLED, FORD BECAME INFECTED WITH COVID-19.

AFTER HIS RECOVERY, FORD WAS TOLD BY SEVERAL

DOCTORS THAT HE HAD "NATURAL IMMUNITY TO COVID-19,"

AND HE THEN CONDUCTED "AN EXTENSIVE RESEARCH

PROJECT " AS TO NATURAL IMMUNITY. (ID.) FROM

THEN UNTIL THE FILING OF HIS COMPLAINT IN

MARCH 2022, FORD DID NOT TEST POSITIVE AGAIN

FOR COVID, ALTHOUGH "NEARLY ALL VACCINATED

PRISONERS AROUND HIM HAVE TESTED POSITIVE." (ID.)

IN DECEMBER 2020, VDOC AND CWC OFFICIALS

DISTRIBUTED A "FIRST SHEET" ABOUT THE COVID "VACCINE"

BEING "OFFERED" TO VDOC PRISONERS, WHICH STATED THAT

i) THE MODERNA COVID VACCINE IS AUTHORIZED ONLY UNDER AN EMERGENCY USE AUTHORIZATION (EUA); ii) IT IS "UNAPPROVED"; iii) THE VACCINE MAY NOT PROTECT EVERYONE; iv) THIS TYPE OF CORONAVIRUS HAS NOT BEEN SEEN BEFORE; v) YOU SHOULD NOT GET THE VACCINE IF YOU'VE EVER HAD AN ALLERGIC REACTION TO THE INGREDIENTS IN THE VACCINE (WHICH THEY'VE NEVER PUBLISHED); vi) THERE ARE SIDE-EFFECTS; vii) IT COULD CAUSE A SEVERE ALLERGIC REACTION; viii) THE SIDE EFFECTS PUBLISHED IN THE PAPER MAY NOT BE ALL THE POSSIBLE SIDE EFFECTS; ix) THERE MAY BE SERIOUS AND UNEXPECTED SIDE EFFECTS; x) THE VACCINE IS STILL BEING STUDIED IN CLINICAL TRIALS; xi) IF YOU EXPERIENCE A SEVERE

ALLERGIC REACTION, CALL 911, OR GO TO THE NEAREST HOSPITAL (WHICH IS NOT POSSIBLE IN THE PRISON AS A PRISONER).

IN EARLY 2021, DEFENDANT HARTSOOK BECAME CCCC'S NEW INSTITUTIONAL PROGRAM MANAGER. FORD ALLEGED THAT SHE BEGAN IMPLEMENTING DIRECTIVES TO IMPLEMENT A "NEW NORMAL", WHICH WERE PASSED DOWN FROM GOVERNOR NOBLES, VDOC DIRECTOR CLARKE, DR. ANTHONY FAUCI, OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH AND THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ALLERGY AND INFECTIOUS DISEASE (NIH AND NIAID RESPECTIVELY), THE CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL (CDC), THE VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH (VDH), AND OTHERS - WHO WERE COLLECTIVELY

CALLED THE "NEW NORMAL COMMITTEE." (12, at 58).

"THE NEW NORMAL," WHICH WOULD BEGIN IN MID-JULY

2021, WOULD ALLOW PERSONS WHO HAD BEEN FULLY

VACCINATED TO ATTEND PROGRAMS, SCHOOL, THE LAW

LIBRARY, OR ANY OTHER SERVICES OFFERED AT CWC,

IF THEY LIVED IN A DORM IN WHICH 75% OF THE PEOPLE

WERE VACCINATED, ALTHOUGH THE REQUIREMENT DID NOT

APPLY TO "RE-ENTRY PROGRAMS" RUN BY THE STATE. (10.)

FORD RAISED HIS CONCERNS OVER THE "NEW NORMAL"

POLICIES TO EACH OF THESE DEFENDANTS. HE EXPLAINED

TO HARRISBOOK AND OTHER DEFENDANTS, AND SUBSEQUENTLY

IN NUMEROUS INFORMAL COMPLAINTS AND GRIEVANCES,

THAT "VACCINATED" AND "UNVACCINATED" PRISONERS

LIVE TOGETHER AT CWCC/UDOC IN DORM-STYLE ROOMS,

SHARE RESTROOMS, AND OTHER EQUIPMENT, AND ARE

MOVED BETWEEN BUILDINGS AND EVEN PRISONS, AND

THAT HALF OF THE CWCC STAFF WAS NOT VACCINATED.

IN LIGHT OF THESE FACTS, "THE NEW NORMAL" PRINCIPLES

MADE "NO SENSE." (Id. at 59). HE FURTHER EXPLAINED

THAT THE PRINCIPLES WERE "UNTIMELY" BECAUSE VIRGINIA'S

STATE OF EMERGENCY ENDED ON JUNE 30, 2021, THAT

DENYING UNVACCINATED PRISONERS ACCESS TO PROGRAMS

WAS DISCRIMINATORY, PUNITIVE, AND A VIOLATION OF

CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTIONS, AND THAT BECAUSE HE AND

EVERYONE AT CWCC ALREADY HAD COVID, THEY HAD

NATURAL IMMUNITY, SO THE "VACCINATIONS" WERE

UNNECESSARY. (12) MOREOVER, FORD CONVEYED THAT NO PHYSICIAN OR OTHER MEDICAL STAFF EVER RECOMMENDED THAT HE GET A COVID "VACCINE." (12.)

FURTHERMORE, ALTHOUGH THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE DOES NOT MENTION IN HER FINAL SUMMARY OF THE CASE, PLAINTIFF EXPLAINED TO DEFENDANTS THAT THEY ARE NOT DOCTORS AND ARE THEREFORE OPERATING OUTSIDE OF THEIR OFFICIAL CAPACITY BY RECOMMENDING AND INITIATING ANY MEDICAL PROCEDURES INCLUDING THE TAKING OF A COVID-SHOT THAT WOULD JEOPARDIZE PLAINTIFF'S HEALTH, MORALS, PRINCIPLES AND SINCERELY-HELD RELIGIOUS BELIEFS. (Pl.'s Comp., RPP 164-166), PLAINTIFF ASKED DEFENDANTS FOR A COPY OF ANY SUCH

DIRECTIVES FROM THE SO-CALLED "NEW NORMAL COMMITTEE",

OR ANY PROOF THAT SUCH A COMMITTEE EVEN EXISTED.

(Id., at PTP 167-168). DEFENDANTS STATED THEY COULD

NOT DISCLOSE TO PLAINTIFF ANY SUCH INFORMATION.

(Id., at PTP 167-168). THEREFORE, PLAINTIFF STATED

THAT HE WOULD SUE. (Id., at 166).

NOTWITHSTANDING, BECAUSE HE REFUSED TO RECEIVE

THE COVID "VACCINE", HE BEGAN TO BE DENIED ACCESS TO

THE LAW LIBRARY, RELIGIOUS SERVICES, AND PROGRAMS.

(Id., at pg. 61). ACCORDING TO FORD, OTHER "NEW

NORMAL" MEASURES INCLUDED A DECREASE IN LAW

LIBRARY HOURS, THE LIBRARY BEING CLOSED AT NIGHT,

A REDUCTION IN RELIGIOUS PROGRAMS FROM TWICE

WEEKLY TO ONCE MONTHLY, EDUCATIONAL AND VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS BEING CUT DOWN, AND VISITATION BEING DECREASED. (Id., at pg. 62-63).

He ALSO STATED THAT DEFENDANTS WERE STILL ENFORCING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES, AT THE TIME OF THE COMPLAINT, THAT MAKE IT MORE LIKELY THAT COVID WILL SPREAD, INCLUDING REFUSING TO TURN ON THE VENTILATION SYSTEM, REFUSING TO GIVE MORE THAN 50 MINUTES OF FRESH AIR OR OUTDOOR RECREATION DAILY, AND INSISTING THAT PRISONERS WEAR MASKS IN CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES. (Id., at 83, 85-86).

As STATED, FORD FILED NUMEROUS COMPLAINTS AND GRIEVANCES ABOUT THE "NEW NORMAL" POLICIES

AND HIS OTHER CLAIMS RAISED IN THIS LAWSUIT.

HE ALSO ALLEGED THAT, AS A RESULT OF BOTH HIS REFUSAL TO BE "VACCINATED" AND HIS FILING OF COMPLAINTS AND GRIEVANCES, DEFENDANTS INSTITUTED A CAMPAIGN OF RETALIATION AGAINST HIM.

ON MARCH 9, 2022, PLAINTIFF, AS A PRO SE PRISONER, FILED A CIVIL ACTION COMPLAINT UNDER 42 U.S.C., SECTION 1983 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT AND PAID THE FULL FILING FEE. IT SHOULD BE NOTED HERE THAT TWO (2) DAYS AFTER THE FILING OF THIS LAWSUIT, DEFENDANTS IMMEDIATELY RETRACTED AND RESCINDED ALL OF THEIR COVID-BASED "VACCINE" RESTRICTIONS AT CWCC AND IN THE VDOC. SEE

Appendix B, MEMORANDUM OPINION, PGS 20-21.

NEVERTHELESS, ON JULY 1, 2022, THE DISTRICT COURT, BY MAGISTRATE JUDGE JOEL C. HARPE, ORDERED THE CLERK TO SERVE PROCESS ON ALL THE NAMED DEFENDANTS.

ON AUGUST 29, 2022, DEFENDANTS, BY COUNSEL, FILED A MOTION TO DISMISS THE COMPLAINT FOR, AMONG OTHER THINGS, LACK OF PERSONAL INVOLVEMENT, FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM FOR WHICH RELIEF CAN BE GRANTED, AND ARGUMENTS THAT DEFENDANTS ARE IMMUNE FROM DAMAGES FOR OFFICIAL CAPACITY CLAIMS. (Id., PG. 8).

ON AUGUST 30, 2022, THE DISTRICT COURT MAGISTRATE JUDGE SENT TO FORD A ROSENBERG NOTICE GRASSING FORD

TO RESPOND BY SENDING ARGUMENTS, AFFIDAVITS AND EXHIBITS
TO SUPPORT HIS CLAIMS AND FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS.

Thereafter, on October 28, 2022, Ford timely
responded to the motion to dismiss and Roseboro notice
by sending an 85-page response and twenty-nine
separate affidavits and attached exhibits and evidence
to support his arguments, claims and factual
allegations. (Id., at 8).

On November 14, 2022, Ford filed a motion
requesting for the Court to request the appointment
of counsel, which the Magistrate Judge denied on
November 15, 2022.

ON JANUARY 13, 2023, FORD FILED A MOTION TO
EXPAND THE RECORD WITH ADDITIONAL AFFIDAVITS,
EVIDENCE AND EXHIBITS.

ON MARCH 31, 2023, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
ELIZABETH K. DILLON DISMISSED THE COMPLAINT IN
A 41-PAGE DECISION, WITH PREJUDICE AND WITHOUT
AN OPPORTUNITY TO AMEND - ASIDE FROM TWO (2)
CLAIMS - WITH INSTRUCTIONS TO REMOVE ALL ALLEGATIONS
RELATED TO COVID-19 AND COVID-19 "VACCINES".

FURTHERMORE, RELYING ON S. WALK AT BROADLANDS

HOMEOWNER'S ASS'n V. OPENBOND AT BROADLANDS, LLC,

713 F.3d 175, 184-85 (4th Cir. 2013), THE DISTRICT

COURT HELD THAT "IT IS WELL ESTABLISHED THAT A

PLAINTIFF MAY NOT AMEND HIS COMPLAINT THROUGH
BRIEFING," AND THAT, "IT IS BOTH INAPPROPRIATE AND
UNNECESSARY FOR THE COURT TO CONSIDER HIS AFFIDAVITS
TO DETERMINE WHETHER HIS CURRENT COMPLAINT STATES
A CLAIM, SO THE COURT HAS NOT CONSIDERED THEM."
(Id., at 10). Accordingly, THE DISTRICT COURT
DISMISSED THE COMPLAINT FOR, AMONG OTHER THINGS,
FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM FOR WHICH RELIEF CAN BE
GRANTED AND THAT DEFENDANTS WERE IMMUNE FROM
LIABILITY IN THEIR OFFICIAL STATE CAPACITY AND COULD
NOT BE HELD PERSONALLY LIABLE.

A TIMELY-FILED REPEAL WAS DENIED BY THE
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH

CIRCUIT ON SEPTEMBER 18, 2023. SEE RECORD NO.

23-6410, APPENDIX A. AND, A TIMELY-FILED

PETITION FOR REHEARING AND PETITION FOR REHEARING

EN BANC WAS DENIED ON OCTOBER 23, 2023 BY THE

SAME COURT. APPENDIX B.

PLAINTIFF TIMELY-FILES THIS PETITION FOR

A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS TO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME

COURT ON THIS 18th DAY OF JANUARY, 2024.

THIS IS THE LAST LEVEL OF EXHAUSTION BEFORE

PLAINTIFF MAY SUBMIT HIS INTERNATIONAL HUMAN

RIGHTS VIOLATION PETITION.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

THERE ARE TWO MAIN ISSUES THAT ARE IMPORTANT
AND REQUIRES THIS COURT'S OPINION: 1) HOW ARE PRO SE
PRISONER CASES TO BE DECIDED BY THE FEDERAL COURTS,
AND 2) IS THE COVID-19 "VACCINE" ACTUALLY A BLIND.

1) HOW ARE PRO SE PRISONER CASES TO BE DECIDED
BY THE FEDERAL COURTS?

IT IS REVERSIBLE ERROR FOR THE DISTRICT COURT
TO FAIL TO CONSIDER A PRO SE LITIGANT'S COMPLAINT IN
LIGHT OF ALL THE FILINGS, INCLUDING FILINGS
RESPONSIVE TO A MOTION TO DISMISS - INCLUDING ITS
AFFIDAVITS AND EXHIBITS. SEE JILL V. TBG FOOD
ACQUISITION CORP., 2020 U.S. DIST. LEXIS 120655

*1-2 (W.D. Va. July 9, 2020) (citing Brown v.

Whole Foods Mkt. Grp., Inc., 789 F.3d 146, 152

(D.C. Cir. 2015)) (citing Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly,

550 U.S. 544, 570, 127 S.Ct. 1955, 167 L.Ed.2d 929

(2007)); see also Richmond v. United States, 193

F.3d 545, 548, 338 U.S. App. D.C. 265 (D.C. Cir.

1999); Towler v. Noble, 752 Fed. Appx. 254, 266

(6th Cir. 2018); Lewis v. Mauskopf, 2022 U.S. Dist.

LEXIS 201820 *6-7 (D.C. Dist. 2022).

THE DISTRICT COURT'S RELIANCE ON S. WALK AS

BROADLANDS HOMEOWNERS' ASS'N V. OPENBAND AS

BROADLANDS, LLC, 713 F.3d 175, 184-85 (4th Cir.

2013) IS MISPLACED. THE COMPLAINT IN SUCH CASE

WAS FILED BY AN ATTORNEY AND DID NOT RELATE TO
A PRO SE LITIGANT AND, THEREFORE, IS NOT DISPOSITIVE
HERE. (SEE APPENDIX B, PG. 10).

THE DISTRICT COURT DID NOT EVEN ALLOW PLAINTIFF
AN OPPORTUNITY TO AMEND HIS COMPLAINT AND STATED
SPECIFICALLY, "IT IS WELL ESTABLISHED THAT A PLAINTIFF
MAY NOT AMEND HIS COMPLAINT THROUGH BRIEFING."

(ID., AT PGS. 10, 38-39). HOWEVER, IN ADDITION TO
THE DISTRICT COURT'S DUTY TO CONSIDER ALL OF A PRO SE
LITIGANT'S FILINGS, A DISTRICT COURT MUST ALSO
LIBERALLY AND FREELY GRANT A PRO SE LITIGANT
LEAVE TO AMEND, AS A MATTER OF RIGHT, AND THE
FAILURE TO DO SO IS REVERSIBLE ERROR. SEE

RICHARDSON V. UNITED STATES, 193 F.3d 545, 548-50,

338 U.S. App. D.C. 265 (D.C. Cir. 1999); TOLLIVER V.

NOBLE, 752 Fed. Appx. 254, 262-65 (6th Cir. 2018);

LEWIS V. MAUSKOPF, 2022 U.S. DIST. LEXIS 201820

*6-7 (D.C. DIST. 2022) ("THE DISTRICT COURT HAD

ABUSED ITS DISCRETION BY DISMISSING THE PLAINTIFF'S

ACCESS CLAIM, DESPITE HIS FAILURE TO REQUEST AN

AMENDMENT, AND REMANDING THE CASE TO ALLOW

THE PLAINTIFF TO AMEND HIS COMPLAINT

WHEN POST-DISMISSAL FILINGS SUGGESTED

PLAINTIFF HAD A VALID CLAIM");

GORDON V. ENGLAND, 354 F. App'x 975, 981-82 (6th

Cir. 2009) (Remanding for leave to amend based on

allegations presented to the appellate court, since

the plaintiff "was proceeding pro se and was likely

to have been unaware of the requirements of Rule

15. ").

The district court, in the instant case, held

that plaintiff attempted to amend his complaint

via his response to defendant's motion to dismiss

and relied upon the decision in S. Walk at

BROADLANDS HOMEOWNERS' ASS'N V. OPEN BANK AT

BROADLANDS, LLC, 713 F.3d 175, 184-85 (4th Cir.

2013). (Appendix B, pg. 10). PROBLEMATIC TO THE

COURT'S RELIANCE ON THIS CASE IS THAT PLAINTIFFS IN THE
CITED CASE WERE ACTUALLY GIVEN AN OPPORTUNITY TO
AMEND THEIR COMPLAINT AND AMENDED THEIR COMPLAINT,
BUT THEN ATTEMPTED TO EXPAND UPON THEIR ALLEGATIONS
IN SUBSEQUENT FILINGS. Id., at 184-85. IN THE
INSTANT CASE, PLAINTIFF WAS NOT GIVEN AN OPPORTUNITY
TO AMEND HIS COMPLAINT IN RELATION TO HIS COVID-19
ALLEGATIONS. PLAINTIFF WAS PRO SE, IN PRISON, AND
WAS DENIED BY THE COURT THE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL.

MOREOVER, PLAINTIFF IS A PRISONER. UNDER THE
PRISON LITIGATION REFORM ACT (PLRA), UPON
RECEIVING A PRISONER-PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT, IT
IS MANDATORY THAT THE DISTRICT COURT SCREEN

SUCH COMPLAINT IN WHOLE OR IN PART IF THE COURT FINDS THAT THE PRISONER-PLAINTIFF'S ALLEGATIONS ARE FRIVOLOUS, MALICIOUS, THE DEFENDANTS ARE IMMUNE FROM LIABILITY, OR IF THE COMPLAINT FAILS TO STATE A CLAIM UPON WHICH RELIEF CAN BE GRANTED.

2) IS THE COVID-19 "VACCINE" ACTUALLY A BWMD?

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT HAS SPECIFICALLY IDENTIFIED THE COVID-19 VIRUS AS A BWMD. (PL.'S MOT. TO EXAMINE, AT PG. 24) (CITING LOST IN THE SURGE-MARKET: FEDERAL TERRORISM PROSECUTIONS FOR COUGHING COVID, 27 WIOENGE L. REV. 177, 179-82 (2021) (LEGAL SCHOLAR LAURA L. GERARD REPORTED ON PG. 179 THAT LAW ENFORCEMENT CONSIDERS COVID-19 AS A

PLAINTIFF REMOVE ALL FACTS AND ALLEGATIONS
CONCERNING COVID-19 AND THE BWMO COVID-19
"VACCINE" IS NONSENSICAL AND ONLY EVIDENCES
THE CONTINUING COVER-UP CONCERNING THE CAUSE AND
SPREAD OF COVID-19.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: January 18, 2024

Raymundo A. Ford, Jr. #187664
PRO SE
COLD SPRINGS CORRECTIONAL UNIT
221 SPITLER CIRCLE
GREENVILLE, VIRGINIA 24440