

NO. 23-55358

23-6700

ORIGINAL

In the Supreme Court of The United States

FILED

OCT 13 2023

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

Courtney Green,

Petitioner ,

V.

The Walt Disney Company

Respondent.

On Petition For Writ of Certiorari to
the United states Court of Appeals For the

Petition for Writ of Certiorari

Courtney Green
P.O. Box 22444
Kansas city,MO 64113

Table of Contents

Question Presented 2

Petition For Writ of Certiorari 2

Decision Below 2

Jurisdiction 3

Federal Rule Involved 6

Statement of Case 6

**I. Green's circumstantial evidence that The Walt disney Company
unconventionally used methods of spyware and abused..... 6**

Reasons For Granting the Writ

II. The United States Court of Appeals ninth Circuit Ruled the Case 17

Electronic surveillance 18

Invasion of Privacy/Voyeurism 19

Spyware 20

Sec. 250.45 Unlawful surveillance in the second degree 21

Consent 21

Non consensual monitoring and surveillance 22

Viewing the sexual/intimate areas of a person 24

Reasonable privacy 25

Eavesdropping 26

Aggravated harassment 27

Unethical Human Experimentation 28

Impactful cases 29

Reason for granting writ 29

Relief 32

Conclusion 33

Related Cases 34

Statutes and Rules 35

Table of Authorities 35

Exhibits 37

Related cases

- Green v. Lg electronics USA inc./LG Electronics Inc. 2:22-07429-PA-JEm
- Green v. Schweitzer brentwood branch Library USCA 22-1905
- Green V. Fox Corporation USCA 22-898
- Green V. ABC Entertainment inc. USCA 22-899
- Green V. NBC Universal Media LLC USCA 22-722
- Green V. live w Kelly and Ryan USCA 22-726
- Green V. Viacom CBS USCA 22-724
- Green v. Vizio 2:22-cv-07429-PA-JEM/ 22-56083
- Green V. Walmart inc. USCA 24-1022
- Green V. Marsh's Sunfresh 23-00838-cv-w-BP

Statues and Rules

American Data privacy act

Electronic communication privacy act

Federal consumer online privacy act

Invasion of privacy

16 CFR Part 313: **Privacy of Consumer Financial Information Rule under the
Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act Consumer Privacy Protection Act of 2017**

Exploitation

Racketeering

Malice

Eavesdropping

Aggravated harassment

Unlawful Surveillance in the Second degree

Table of Authorities

❖ **Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319 (1989)** ➤

<https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/490/319/>

❖ **Consumer Privacy Act (CPA)**

➤ <https://www.consumerprivacyact.com/>

❖ **H.R.4081 - Consumer Privacy
Protection Act of 2017**

➤ <https://www.congress.gov/bill/115th-congress/house-bill/4081> ❖ **16 CFR Part 313:
Privacy of Consumer Financial Information Rule under the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act**

➤ <https://www.ftc.gov/business-guidance/privacy-security>

(Exhibit A)

Question Presented

Whether the respondent Paramount acted negligently in addressing the conduct of its staff and the integrity of its network. Did Paramount unconventionally use data and spyware capabilities in a manner that violated privacy laws, electronic and network regulations, statutes and the petitioners constitutional rights. Did employees of the respondent Paramount participate in conduct that aided in corrupt intent and racketeer influenced acts; At the expense of The petitioners Character; were methods of unconsented surveillance in fact used to exploit, defame, profit, control, gather and distribute personal data and other findings about the petitioners person for ulterior motives?

Petition For Writ of Certiorari

Petitioner Courtney Green respectfully requests the issuance of a writ of certiorari to review the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Decision Below

The decision of the district of California is published in the ninth circuit 2022.

The decision of the United States Court of appeals is published at the ninth Circuit 2023.

Jurisdiction
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

December 17,2023 Case was filed with Central district of California courts Courtney Green v. The Walt Disney Company **Case Number:**2:22-cv-09271-SVW-RAO

December 28,2023 case dismissed with prejudice because the action failed to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, the plaintiff failed to state specifics for when, how and why the monitoring of my person occurred., IFP application denied.

March 24,2023 Motion to vacate order of dismiss and reinstate; Response to order dismissing with prejudice filed by plaintiff Courtney Green. RE: ORDER DISMISSING WITH PREJUDICE [19]. (aco)

March 31,2023 ORDER ON MOTION FOR LEAVE TO APPEAL IN FORMA PAUPERIS by Judge Stephen V. Wilson. The court has considered the motion and the motion is DENIED.

The Court certifies that the proposed appeal is not taken in good faith under 28 U.S.C. 1915(a) and is frivolous, without merit and does not present a substantial question within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. 753(f).; DENYING [34] MOTION for Leave to Appeal In Forma Pauperis. (aco)

April 4,2023 Motion to vacate order of dismiss and reinstate filed by plaintiff Courtney Green. RE: ORDER DISMISSING WITH PREJUDICE [19]. Motion set for hearing on 4/17/2023 at 01:30 PM before Judge Stephen V. Wilson. (aco)

April 5,2023 MINUTES OF ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO VACATE [37] by Judge Stephen V. Wilson. Accordingly, the motion is DENIED. Furthermore, the Court advises Plaintiff that it will not accept any further filings in this case, except for a Notice of Appeal from this Order. (SEE DOCUMENT FOR FURTHER DETAILS).; DENYING [37] Motion to vacate order of dismiss and reinstate. (aco)

April 5,2023 RESPONSE BY THE COURT TO NOTICE TO FILER OF DEFICIENCIES IN FILED DOCUMENT RE: Motion to vacate order of dismiss and reinstate [19][37] by Judge Stephen V. Wilson. The court accepts the motion as filed. The motion is submitted. Order to issue. The hearing is vacated and off-calendar. (aco)

April 17,2023 Motion and Affidavit for Leave to Appeal in Forma Pauperis to the 9th CCA re: Notice of Appeal to 9th Circuit Court of Appeals, [43] filed by Courtney Green. [Notice of the filing is sent to the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals.] (car)

United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

April 19,2023 NOTIFICATION from Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals of case number assigned and briefing schedule. Appeal Docket No. 23-55358 assigned to Notice of Appeal to 9th Circuit Court of Appeals, [43] as to Plaintiff Courtney Green. (mat)

April 20,2023 Filed clerk order (Deputy Clerk: JW): A review of

the district court's docket reflects that the district court has certified that this appeal is not taken in good faith and is frivolous. See 28

U.S.C. § 1915(a). This court may

dismiss a case at any time, if the court determines the case is frivolous.

See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). Within 35 days after the date of this order, appellant must: (1) file a motion to dismiss this appeal, see Fed. R. App. P.

42(b), or (2) file a statement explaining why the appeal is not frivolous and should go forward. If appellant files a statement that the appeal should go forward, appellant also must: (1) file in this court a motion to proceed in forma pauperis, OR (2) pay to the district court

\$505.00 for the filing and docketing fees for this appeal AND file in this court proof that the \$505.00 was paid. If appellant does not respond to this order, the Clerk will dismiss this appeal for failure to prosecute, without further notice. See 9th Cir. R. 42-1. If appellant files a motion to dismiss the appeal, the Clerk will dismiss this appeal, pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 42(b). If appellant submits any response to this order other than a motion to dismiss the appeal, the court may dismiss this appeal as frivolous, without further notice. The briefing schedule for this appeal is stayed. The Clerk shall serve on appellant: (1) a form motion to voluntarily dismiss the appeal, (2) a form statement that the appeal should go forward, and (3) a Form 4 financial affidavit. Appellant may use the enclosed forms for any motion to dismiss the appeal, statement that the appeal should go forward, and/or motion to proceed in forma pauperis.

[12699822] (CKP)

Filed order (BRIDGET S. BADE, KENNETH K. LEE and LAWRENCE VANDYKE) : The district court certified that this appeal is not taken in good faith and denied leave to proceed in forma pauperis. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). On **April 20, 2023**, the court ordered appellant to explain in writing why this appeal should not be dismissed as frivolous. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) (court shall dismiss case at any time, if court determines it is frivolous or malicious). Upon a review of the record and the opening briefs, we conclude this appeal is frivolous. We therefore deny appellant's motion to proceed in forma pauperis (Docket Entry No. [5]) and dismiss this appeal as frivolous, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). All other pending motions are denied as moot. No further filings will be entertained in this closed case. DISMISSED.

[12800262] (RT) The week of **May 15,2023** petitioner sent in complaint brief/Questionable arguments. ****>May 22,2023** Filed original and 0 copies of Appellant Courtney Green opening brief of 25 pages (Informal: No). Served via ECF on 05/22/2023. (briefing remains stayed) [12720377] (KT)

****>May 26,2020; May 30,2023** Filed Appellant Courtney Green letter dated 05/24/2023 re: Request for case opening packet. Paper filing deficiency: None.

[12724901] (RL) {original packet was never received}

May 30,2023 Filed Appellant Courtney Green FORM 14 motion for extension of time. Deficiencies: None. Served on 05/24/2023.

[12724856] (RL) ****>June 6,2023** Received original and 0 copies of Appellant Courtney Green opening brief of 6 pages (Informal: Yes). Served on 06/07/2023. Major deficiency: not accompanied by motion to file substitute brief. Notified Appellant. [12734074] (KT)

June 20,2023 Filed Appellant Courtney Green addendum to motion to expand the record. Dated 06/13/2023. Paper filing deficiency: None.

[12739203] (RL) **June 27,2023** Filed Appellant Courtney Green addendum to motion to expand record. Dated 06/27/2023. Paper filing deficiency: None. [12748691] (RL)

September 27,2023 Filed order (BRIDGET S. BADE, KENNETH K. LEE and LAWRENCE VANDYKE) : The district court certified that this appeal is not taken in good faith and denied leave to proceed in forma pauperis. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). On April 20, 2023, the court ordered appellant to explain in writing why this appeal should not be dismissed as frivolous. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) (court shall dismiss case at any time, if court determines it is frivolous or malicious). Upon a review of the record and the opening briefs, we conclude this appeal is frivolous. We therefore deny appellant's motion to proceed in forma pauperis (Docket Entry No. [5]) and dismiss this appeal as frivolous, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). All other pending motions are denied as moot. No further filings will be entertained in this closed case. DISMISSED. [12800262] (RT)

Federal Rule Involved

Media and network personnel openly used spyware and other methods of electronic surveillance to collect data, eavesdrop and harass the petitioner; Actively participating in the act of Invasion of Privacy through the disclosure of private facts and intrusion of solitude, Illegal gathering and disbursement of private information. Violating the electronic communications privacy act, the stored communications act, consumer privacy protections act, the cybersecurity information sharing act. Participating in racketeer influenced acts with corrupt intent, exploitation, defamation of character, malice and non consensual use of private information and personal data, eavesdropping, misconduct, harassment and violation of professional conduct, exposure of trade secrets resulting in unfair business practices, consumer privacy act.

Statement of Case

The respondent The Walt Disney Company unconventionally used methods of spyware, eavesdropping and company data collection and surveillance capabilities to target, gather and exchange intel about the petitioners person throughout its network and mass audience. These methods were used to conceal acts of exploitation, non consensual monitoring and studying of the petitioner through constant intrusion of his private dwelling place. These acts of misconduct have continuously occurred since 2020 and due to the respondents negligence in addressing the integrity of its network it has aided in the pain and suffering of the petitioner and show to be undoubtable organized corrupt intent and racketeer influenced acts.

I. Green's circumstantial evidence shows that the Walt Disney Company unconventionally used methods of spyware and abused network capabilities to surveil, eavesdrop, exploit, intrude solitude and harass the petitioner constantly from 2020 to present year 2023.

During October of 2019 I began noticing that while watching television shows employees of different television networks seem to look as if they were attempting to converse with me through the television. This notion began while tuning into the espn show “highly questionable” when sports analyst Mina Kimes stated “*You're going to pay for this*” along with mentions of ratings. During the live w Kelly and Ryan show, on consecutive morning airings of the show between the dates of 09/20/2021-11/18/2021 Host Kelly Ripa along with co host Ryan acknowledge in one form or another that they could physically see me through the tv by making direct and indirect comments about what I would at the time be currently doing, wearing, things I had eaten etc. to confirm I was who they were speaking of; Mrs. Ripa also made indirect comments about my person such as financial status, state of mind stating that I was crazy and/or delusional and going to need therapy; referring to the then unexplainable occurrences that were happening in which tv personnel stated I had no proof, which turned out to be the doing of an organized group. Doing this time Host Kelly Ripa also openly stated that the monitoring of my person and the constant stalking and gathering of my private information would “*Go on forever*” and it was also implied that there was no place I could hide, there were also hints at a pre planned expiration date of some sort. During this show Kelly Ripa also mentioned my living arrangements, at the time I was in between homes and it was stated on several occasions that I was homeless. Etc. The information being dispersed was discovered to be gathered through various forms of internet stalking and data collection which was mentioned in Missouri Cases (ref. Green v. Kansas city Public Library Waldo Branch USCA 22-2469, Green v. Kansas city Public Library Trails west branch USCA 22-2468, Green V. Midwest genealogy Center USCA 22-1915, Green V. Mid continent Public Library North Independence, Green V. Schweitzer Brentwood Branch Library USCA 22-1905). This information was exchanged by virtual and in person conversations with show guests or implemented into show criteria and sketches. On the week of Halloween there was a prop of a giant skeleton that was placed on the show coincidently identical to the giant skeleton prop that was on a street that I frequently walked down, on my daily route to the bus stop to further acknowledge that I was being stalked. In some instances Kelly Ripa also hinted at these occurrences going on forever. One morning while viewing the show Host Kelly Ripa and cohost were making jokes and poking fun; Kelly and ryan began playing a prize game on the show with a call in viewer, the caller recognized what was happening and stated that she was recording this airing. Kelly Ripa then attempted to intimidate by attempting to gather the caller's information. This was also mentioned in USCA 22-898 green v. Fox Corporation. Why was specific information that had been obtained through the monitoring of my online browsing activity being openly shared if I was not in fact being targeted? For what purpose would a television personality be conversing about an at home consumer in misconducted, bullying and abusive manners if it were not for intended malice. During this time Kelly ripa openly made claims and hints in regards to well being in statements like and I quote “*Something bad's going to happen*” and other instances making claims to specific age limits etc. on average The live with Kelly and Ryan show caters to 2.3 million viewers per week. Out of all these viewers how

and why was I singled out if there was not some form of surveillance or ulterior motive. It is shown during this timeframe the Host of the show knew when I tuned in by acknowledging in numerous ways such as specific culinary choices, clothing and garments for example; at the time I slept under a pink comforter that was openly acknowledge to further show that it was in fact me that she was talking too. Not only was Host Kelly and Ryan aware of the surveillance of my person but crew members were aware as well as the network the respondent The Walt Disney Company was aware and neglected to address the issue. In one instance Co-host Ryan attempted to warn host Kelly Ripa of her misconduct but those warnings went ignored. In another instance while tuning into the show during the early morning hour Kelly Ripa was doing her usual talk careless rants and while conversing as usual at the beginning of segments and not only spoke in regards to me but also made reference towards family member that was believed to have been tuning in as well where Mrs. Ripa also made abusive slurs and exhibited bullying misconduct, During/around this segment there were mentions of ginger tea and as well as other flavors and talks of food preferences. Following these episodes there appeared a stand-in host That also made references to my person as 4 amongst other names that were being stated in reference to my person at the time. This female show host also participated in the same harassing behavior. Host also found clever ways to indirectly say the name "Courtney" during the show as seen and done on other occasions in other incidents with other shows etc. I submitted subpoenas to the courts for visual proof of these incidents. This also occurred on other occasions with other stand in hosts also referring to me as 4. Also when Michael Strahan was a co- host on the show in 2020 and 2021 when I first began noticing that the viewing of my person was taking place, I was always puzzled, confused, irritated or uncomfortable while watching television so during this time I was told to do things like "smile" and different scenarios were arranged in attempts to gain knowledge of personal preference or learn my person with show host even stating that *"We want to get to know you"* as if they were attempting to make this into some sort of interactive reality show or ease me into being use to or comfortable with being on camera. Throughout this debacle there were several mentions of contractual agreement with statements such as *"He's under contract, so it's all legal"* in a taunting manner. During and around 2020 throughout early 2021 it was stated and made out as if this was a 24/7 reality show, in some instances said that I was not real and that I was a virtual creation even going as far as showing some interactive virtual female being and saying that's what I was. In some instances host of shows would either make expressions that they saw me make or these expressions would be implemented into skits or media material. This was also mentioned in similar Filings with Fox Corporation and ABC Entertainment Inc. and lg electronics (*Green V. Fox Corporation USCA 22-898, green v. Abc Entertainment Inc. USCA 22-899*). During the Drew Barrymore show between the dates 09/15/2021-11/15/2021, Drew Barrymore as well as the co host participated in jokingly comments on and about my person and even added in a bit about previous clothing style options such as green cargo pants that I had previously worn in the past amongst other things showing that they were in fact talking about me and explained why random photos of me were being taken by

strangers while I was out and about, further proving orchestrated acts of stalking. In one particular instance Drew Barrymore was conversing with a guest on the show about a movie "Miss Meadows" she was promoting where the catchphrase for her character was "too-do-loo!" ; they began joking about mishaps they had seen me go through in retrospect to the daily stalking/ following that was occurring at the time. Aside from having random photos taken by strangers while out, I also experienced mishaps while grocery shopping. These issues included the monitoring and studying of food choices which led to exploitation of culinary choices, controlled grocery options as well as the tampering of and contamination of goods purchased; which I have reported and submitted numerous complaints about. While viewing this segment The guest star shouted and I quote "Go to the store" while laughing she also made other comments regarding culinary choices such as cereal and milk that I would frequently purchase and be eating during the mornings while viewing this and other morning shows. This further confirmed not only my daily habits were being studied and monitored but my shopping habits were as well. This also raised the notion that secret footage was being exploited. I also submitted a subpoena to the courts for the timeframe of this incident. In another instance while viewing the Drew Barrymore show, there were props on the show set up similar to the likeness of the bedroom at the place in which I was residing at the time which led me to believe that there were other methods of hidden surveillance/spyware being used as well that were also being secretly monitored and exploited because there was no television in the bedroom, As the guest and Drew Barrymore conversed the guest began indirectly making comments regarding findings and things about my person that led me to believe there were forms of stalking happening. This was also mentioned in similar Filings with Viacom CBS and ABC Entertainment inc. and Lg Electronics (ref. Green V. Viacom CBS USCA 22-724, green v. ABC Entertainment Inc. USCA 22-899, green v. Lg Electronics USA inc/Lg Electronics inc.). In another instance/episode Ms. Barrymore hosted guests from a previous movie she had done called "Charlie's Angels" where they played a game to see if the crowd could figure out which one of the guest stars was actually in the studio on stage and which was an illusion as a play on AI technology and delusion.

This was also mentioned in similar Filings with Viacom CBS and ABC Entertainment inc. and Lg Electronics (ref. Green V. Viacom CBS USCA 22-724, green v. ABC Entertainment Inc. USCA 22-899, green v. Lg Electronics USA inc/Lg Electronics inc.).

During an airing of the show Tell the truth on the dates 07/18/2021 as I tuned in ;contestants and guest celeb appearances observed me tuning in and stated that I was in the attic/upstairs,referring to the room I had just checked into through Airbnb. (see Exhibit A)

On GMA and GMA3,The cast acknowledged they could see me and at times joked around and also made comments about my person. In one particular instance T.JHolmes held a discussion during GMA3 with a doctor between September 2021 and November 2021 , amidst this conversation genetic modification was hinted

at/towards my reproductive system, As well as other things including but not limited to the handling of species and other genetic factors. From 2020 - present I have been having issues with stored bought food and beverages consumed having effects on different body parts as well as other issues not food related which I have filed complaints regarding food safety. One of the body parts included genitals and reproductive areas, This further confirmed the notion that there was some sort of experimental testing happening without my knowledge which partially explained why my eating habits and culinary choices were being so heavily monitored. Through this debacle, it has been shown while viewing different programs that it would be acknowledged that tv personnel would know at times what specific body part, food consumed would or had affected at that point in time and would hint at it in one form or another. This has not been the first time genetic modification has been hinted at while viewing a program. In another instance, On a November 17,2022 Airing of the Tonight show with Jimmy Fallon; While tuning in host Jimmy Fallon held a discussion with guest Martha Stewart and there were hints at surveillance and recent culinary choices were jokingly mocked such as snap peas and other foods I had eaten or purchased around that time; there were even remarks made hinting at methods of surveillance being planted inside my

refrigerator; Advertising reps on HSN and QVC also made mentions of monetary methods with remarks like *"He put it in the bottom drawer"*.

([ref.https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2aH7bY175Go&t=2s](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2aH7bY175Go&t=2s)).

Other Mentions of this were outlined in a (*Minnesota filing against General Mills Ref. green v. General Mills headquarters 22-cv-27237 ECT/ECW*) Aside from these mentions in several instances dating back to 2020, it has also been implied in many ways of a preplanned expiration date. Also during the week of a segment on GMA3, a female reporter visited Antarctica. The host of the show openly joked about the viewing of my person through the television. One day while viewing GMA3 between September of 2021 through November of 2021 T.J. Holmes stated and I quote "We've been doing this for a long time" x amount of years and if you wanted to find them were in New York and giving the show studio location address, during this airing the anchor also stated and I quoted "I'll put \$10,000 on it".Following this event on December 12,2021 there was a tornado that hit Edwardsville, Illinois.While ABC news was covering this story there was a camera set on the ground in grass and in the frame there was a tree limb sat in a specific angle. During this time,often in the morning I would get up and open the front door and go outside and come back in. On this morning when I walked outside a tree limb was placed on the lawn in the specific way the limb was that appeared in the camera lens.After seeing this and coming back inside, news correspondent T.J. Holmes came on screen and gave a dead stare face as a form of intimidation. Within these months , following these escalations amongst others; On GMA Michael Strahan attempted to ask for this fiasco to Stop. Why would a host on

national television be asking fellow co-workers To stop if these were frivolous allegations? This same host also made this same request during a Fox Sports halftime update along with asking the question and I quote “Can we do this?” This was also mentioned in a New York pro se claim against the Fox corporation (*Ref. Green v. Fox Corporation USCA 22-898 Document title “Statement of Facts” Between weeks 12-15 sports commentators began noticing the viewing experience was becoming less enjoyable and saw that these actions were having a negative effect and they could get in Trouble, anchor Michael Strahan asked for this behavior to stop.*)

On Kspr33 News anchors implemented obtained information into daily news stories as well as acknowledged that they could view me while on air. For example; During the dates of 11/10/2021-11/15/2021 I applied and went through the virtual interviewing process for a call center position and during the evening news a reporter in the field implemented this into a news story by reporting in a cubical to let me know he saw this and this is where I would be potentially working. (see Exhibit B) This was also mentioned in a Missouri pro se filing involving invasion of privacy through cyber stalking (*green v. Schweitzer Brentwood branch library USCA 22-1906*). In another instance during the beginning of the month of February 02/01/2022-02/11/2022 a snow storm came in and on the day it melted the reporters reported standing in front of a bus stop to indicate that I would be on the buses and that I was leaving. Also during Ozark Sports there were clips implemented into show criteria hinting at different information about my person. During airings there were also talks directly and indirectly at me.

There were also mentions of the viewing of me through the television during the 2021 American Music Awards and grammys. While these actions were denied and made out to be frivolous and/or delusional it was openly shown in every opportunity given to be fact. While viewing the 2021 American Music Awards a Musician stated while performing that “*I should love myself*”. During this show there were also loose hints during performances depicting incidents and indirect comments made towards my person. Oftentimes throughout this debacle I felt the feeling of helplessness, embarrassment and estranged bewilderment because without sufficient proof it was impossible to even explain what had and was happening all the while physically seeing occurrences illustrated through the entertainment industry. While viewing the 2021 Emmy Awards, Indirect comments and other acknowledgements were made that I was tuning into the program, in one instance An actress made jokes

While giving a speech for a award and commented in a taunting mocking manner “*This is what it looks like to win.*” person. Also during the 2022 Emmy awards there were further acknowledgments that I was being viewed through the television as well as clear indications that the viewing and monitoring of my person was being exploited through the film industry and made out as a mockery This was also shown during the 2022 oscars as well. During the Emmys, one actress while delivering a speech stated that I was not supposed to be watching. At the time there was a NFL Football game on a different channel that I was switching back and forth from. This is one of several incidents exhibiting how

my viewing habits were being monitored and/or manipulated to control when and what to watch and furthermore shows how this issue has been attempted to be covered up or hidden from being addressed. During viewings of these award ceremonies and entertainment events while being acknowledged that I was tuning in, Often times there would be giggles and puzzled looks as if it were unclear to the attendees why I was watching the program because these were the very people participating in and benefiting from exploitation and causing my defamation and they were being awarded for it; This further showed me that I was indeed being exploited throughout the entertainment industry and that they all in some form or way participated or aided in this calamity and had profited through what was to the world seen as art and were being rewarded for it. While observing this, it often gave a distasteful and discomfoting feeling. Following this I the petitioner Courtney Green wrote complaints to television networks and manufacturers via letter, complaint portal and via email. I also reached out to the department of consumer affairs. (See Exhibit C)

During the 2021 Airing of Dancing with the stars there were hints that I could be seen through the television and even could be seen how this situation not only affected me but was in some form or fashion affecting performances and the entertainers as well on this show as well as other programs. I began the process of pursuing legal proceedings against libraries where the intrusion of privacy and my online browsing activity was being monitored as well as Television networks in late November, Host of the show Dancing with the stars stated “*Can't get a hold of your lawyers, They're all busy*” in a taunting fashion further alerting me that I was not only being monitored through means of television and information from my online browsing data was being stalked, but used to control the situation in to there advantage. Around this time I also began seeing commercials for the very lawyers I was reaching out to and calling. This was explained in a Missouri lawsuit regarding invasion of privacy through cyber stalking (Ref. Green v. schweitzer brentwood branch library) (see Exhibit D)

Ref. “Statement of Facts” (In the beginning of December of 2021 starting 12/3/2021- 12/17/2021 I began searching for lawyers/legal representation to pursue a suit against Schweitzer Brentwood Branch Library regarding this matter and again while doing so employees of the branch saw what I was doing and alerted each other as well as branch visitors and began devising ways to figure out who my representation would be and what actions were being taken. Around this time I began seeing commercials for the law companies I was reaching out to. Unable to find any firm willing to take this case or any other for that matter; I began the process of filing a civil suit 12/18/2021. On one particular day as I was conducting my search and filling out documents for the suit logged into and using adobe a female employee of the Schweitzer Brentwood Branch Library dressed in a red top with curly hair and glasses stood on looking and raised her hand and counted down and when she got to 0, without being

able to save my progress or log out of any accounts (such as email, adobe etc.); my computer logged off and turned off. After that happened I began noticing that documents were being compromised, moved, deleted/alterd and/or having issues opening sending, editing or delays in the adobe program as well as hints that my email and my adobe account had been hacked. Around this time I also began seeing talks of lawsuits while viewing NFL football. On fox sports there were mentions of arbitration cases as well as one sports anchor stating bluntly that "He's not going to win by himself", Talks of lawsuits and indirect discussions were conducted on local news as well as on Newsy and many other programs as phishing methods to see if they were legally liable for participating in these actions etc. I printed off and attempted to send in

paper copies of the initial filing Green v. Schweitzer Brentwood Branch Library 12/24/2021. The case was filed 01/11/2021. During the dates 12/24/2021 through 02/05/2022 I sent case filing documents via usps mail from the post office located at 1442 S Glenstone Ave Springfield, Mo 65804, While doing so

post office workers made mentions and comments about what was happening and/or things that they heard or saw pertaining to what was happening laughing further showing that this was happening.) During this time I experienced delays in correspondents being submitted and received with the courts, I also began seeing specific law offices that I had reached out to advertised on commercials as well as specific talks of information in legal documents that were in the development stages that had not been printed or submitted to the courts yet, this included mentions and implemented information into news stories, sketches show criteria etc. on local news, global news, during sports talks, late night shows and daytime talk shows etc. while observing this I reached out to cyber security organizations and later discovered this information was openly shared as well showing how this was being attempted to be covered up, hidden and how this neglected situation was escalating to further extents. In another instance Around the time I began the process of creating and submitting a petition for Writ Certiorari for ABC Entertainment in November through December of 2022 and after being denied and submitting a new filing in the southern district court of new york against the respondent The Walt Disney company CV22-9271-SVW(RAOx), employees of the respondent were still participating in misusing there media platform to gathering findings to avoid recourse and figure out my online browsing activity; In one instance after have submitted filings in these cases a member of the household where I was residing now divorced and no longer around actively interacted with associates of the respondent during and evening news segment shouting aloud at the tv "It's not a problem!". During this time this case as well as similar cases regarding relative issues were being simultaneously closed, placed in default, dismissed etc. Further Exhibiting another way The Respondent The Walt Disney company was using this concealed method of spyware and monitoring to there advantage.

During the 2021-2022 and 2022-2023 Dick Clark's Rockin New years eve with Ryan Seacrest there were acknowledgements and mentions of my person; through performances as well as program host. This included the Disneyland Rockin 'Eve celebration in Los Angeles and the New Orleans Celebration. In the 2022 and the 2023 celebration I watched while switching back and forth between ABC and NBC networks where I also viewed the Miley Cyrus new years party; during the 2021-22

news years airing it was mentioned by Miley and co host pete davidson that I was home alone and had no friends amongst other indications that I was being monitored through means of television or other forms of surveillance. During the 2021-22 ABC rockin new years eve program it was acknowledged that I could be seen and also mentioned and further implemented into performance and show criteria direct and indirect comments about my person. During the 2022-23 new years eve celebrations there were further instances where direct and indirect mentions of my person were mention and the monitoring of my person were further shown to be true while again viewing both the Dick clark annual rockin new Years celebration including new york times square, disneyland in Los Angeles and New Orleans; as well as while tuning into the Miley cyrus New years party with co host Dolly Parton . While Viewing the Miley Cyrus New years party there were Direct mentions of occurrence stated in New york and Missouri lawsuit filings about my online browsing activity amongst other things while comical guest from “Saturday Night Live” performed comedic skits and interacted with the crowd, There were also indirect mentions of the viewing and/or monitoring of my person during a live musical performance a musical artist pointed up as to hint at or signal that there was a hidden surveillance device of some sort, this also occurred on many instances before while viewing other live programs. Also while watching comical “Saturday Night Live” stars interact with the crowd, it was openly stated that and implied that they were using jokes about my person to distract and stale time stating and I quote “*Are we stalling for something*”. When I switched back over to the abc network’s Dick clark's Rockin New years eve celebration; a musical guest was finishing up addressing/speaking to the audience. Further exhibiting yet another tactic used to manipulate and control my television preferences as previously mentioned with the Emmy awards show and the NFL football game. While watching the 2022-23 new orleans segment of The dick clark rockin new years celebration following the count down to the new year it was implied indirectly that perhaps some sort of satellite or skyview method was also being used for surveillance purposes as well. Mentions of the 2021-22 and 2023-23 Miley Cyrus new years parties as well as incidents involving “Saturday Night Live” SNL were also mentioned in a petition sent to the supreme Court (ref. Green v. NBC Universal media llc USCA 22-722) as well as other filings involving television manufacturers (ref. Green v. LG electronics usa/Lg Electronics inc. USCA 23-1062, green v. vizio inc. USCA USCA 22-56083).

While tuning into an episode of Supermarket Sweep airing live in Los Angeles, host Leslie Jones mentioned that It had been 3 years referring to the viewing of my person through the television and the exploitation that I was enduring; as she taunted and stated that I was a “*loser*”. Other implementations were mentioned throughout 2022 between the months of July of 2022 through September of 2022 on shows like press your luck where the show host implemented indirect rumors and financial findings secretly obtained into game show criteria further showing that my banking data was still being stalked and monitored. On Generation Gap between the months of June of 2022 through October of 2022 host kelly Ripa mentioned Aloud to the audience “*you guys saved me*” in reference to previous actions mentioned in legal proceedings that occurred back in 2021 on the live with kelly and ryan show. Why

would this same host that was mentioned in previous filings for participating in harassing, abusive and bullying misconduct; encouraging the act of stalking, misusing her media platform and social stature to gather and disperse personal private information to the masses and participate in corrupt racketeering influenced acts which all were dismissed and deemed as frivolous (*Ref. green v. Live w Kelly and Ryan show USCA 22-276, green v. Abc Entertainment USCA 22-899, green v. Fox Corporation 22-898*), be thanking live audiences and viewers following these incidents; if this were not true? It further more confirms that Her television show audience and network following did in fact help in this whole ordeal proving organized and racketeer influenced acts against my person. Also during March 2023 and April 2023 While tuning into America's Funniest videos, host Alfonso Ribeiro saw me tuning in and began indirectly making joking comments toward my person even stating in one instance "quite frankly in my opinion you're overpaid". The host even did a bit where he spent in and out of the camera frame and mentioned delusion, and as participated in finding a clever way to mention the name "Courtney" by having a staff member appear on the show with the same name after making these mocking remarks. I have reached out to television manufacturers regarding this cyber breach, have also sent a complaint to the department of consumer affairs and these incidents have also been mentioned in other related cases regarding these similar issues (*ref. Green v. Vizio Inc. 2:22-07429-PA-JEm, green v. LG electronics 22-06057, green v. general mills world HQ 0:22-cv-02737-ECT-ECW, green v Schweitzer brentwood branch Library USCA 22-1905*). In mid march of 2022 I acquired a new PO Box which is also the addressed on file with the courts. Shortly after obtaining the mailing address, while viewing and espn talk show, sports analyst's were conversing and specifically mentioned the numbers of my po box and zipcode while making making jokes about my person. This clearly violated the boundaries of my privacy and proved that some form of stalking and/or tabs were being kept on me. I previously mentioned in prior filings about issues with mail and post office visits and to have my personal address mentioned during a live broadcasting where millions of viewers watch without my consent is both a violation of federal law and other laws and statutes Not only was this personal information spoke about but was exposed during a live airing seen by the masses; further showing how this invasion of privacy breach has intruded my personal life and also exhibiting how this television platform is used to disburse private facts and other information without consent to the masses, causing unwarranted exposure and a negative impact on one's personal life. Espn caters to millions of viewers on a daily and weekly basis; I have observed personal information and/or direct and indirect comments and conversations regarding my person implemented into shows and live airing of sporting events ranging from NFL, NBA, Hockey interviews and interaction, halftime shows, sports analyst talk shows etc.

Often During the months of October of 2021 through January of 2022 I would watch a television show or movie through an app such as Hulu(one of Disney's apps), netflix, Peacock or tubi and those actors would appear as guests on talk shows or on late night shows which further indicated that my viewing data was being monitored and tracked, this happened on a few different occasions where movie stars

would appear knowing that I had watched their show or movies. Also while utilizing the respondent The Walt Disney company Hulu app, there would be instances where I would be attempting to view a movie and it would instantly be blocked or the app would crash and I would have to reboot the television and that particular show or movie would no longer be available to watch. This would also happen in instances where I would be browsing shows and movies and watch a few trailers for selection and I would go back in attempts to find this particular movie or show and it would be gone. In doing so these selections would be switched out for alternative customized options that either implemented the likeness of my person or certain scenarios or have a hidden message in show/movie titles. After having watched different movies or shows through apps, while tuning into talk shows the host would say things like “*I thought you’d like that*” or talk around or make reference to different reactions or things that were seen. During September 2023 viewings of ABC news around the time of the 75 year anniversary I tuned into the evening news and observed The weather man while giving the evening forecast making comments regarding suits, stating “*There only 3 left, I believe we can do it*” this was in regards to the case that were all being dismissed and the remaining that they were working

to figure out a way to get closed. Recently during this time all the nightly talk shows had stopped doing live airing and were running reruns of 2021 and 2022 segments to create a sense of delusion or make it seem as if I were making up things that had happened. During this time A careful planning of scheduling was orchestrated to make sure that things would be controlled or staged, such as certain viewing options on television. As stated before that the stalking and monitoring of my daily habits are being studied, these findings and information is then used to orchestrate, predict and manipulate outcome. For instance, by studying my schedule the respondent was able In one instance while tuning into a sports broadcast it was stated “*Control what we can*”. For instance Late night shows stopped airing live segments and began airing reruns of shows, during this time I had yet again had issues with securing employment with the desired schedule. In mid September I finally was able to obtain employment working a night shift. During the first week of employment Tuesday September 26,2023 While on lunch break around midnight Espn was on the break room television and I observed the 2 female analysts acknowledge they could see me, along with this there were also other coworkers in the breakroom that in some form also acknowledged they were aware of the viewing of my person. On September 27,2023 this case green v. The Walt Disney company was dismissed as frivolous. A few days later after viewing the days that I entered for break and monitoring when I got off. October 2023 the late night shows on networks mentioned in filings began airing live segments of their shows again, It was also hinted at and stated while tuning into the evening news of fox4 on a night off that I had obtained new employment and the status of insurance etc. this is one of numerous ways organized plots have been devised and used to control the outcome in the respondents favor, further showing signs of corrupt intent and racketeer influenced acts. With this new schedule I would be also unavailable to tune into

shows like Dancing with the stars that had just begun airing in October which was also mentioned in this suit for incidents back in 2021 as well as other shows airing such as ,the chase, ABC News etc. further confirming what was stated by the Male meteorologist on ABC evening news. Also during this time there had been several calculated acts staged to deceive and cast an illusion of my person publicly. Also during this time a lady weather anchor with ABC news also made comments regarding my person and to acknowledge I was viewing as well. Also on 2023 show “The Chase” while viewing, there were also indirect comments and things implemented into game show questions that hinted at my person.

II. The United States Court of Appeals ninth Circuit Ruled the Case be dismissed as frivolous.

Frivolous

adjective

1. Unworthy of serious attention; trivial.

2. Inappropriately silly.

3. Of little weight or importance; not worth notice; slight.

- I ask the courts how after 3 years and numerous complaints, all pertaining to similar and relative issues; These issues being openly spoken about and broadcasted on several major networks with acknowledgement of validation is this case not worthy of attention. Has the petitioner not given fiscal factual evidence proving without doubt I have been targeted? Am I excluded from constitutional rights or rights to privacy? I ask the courts; Are these not crimes Written into law? Isn't using legal company resources and capabilities intended for purposes of legitimate professional business practices for illegal activity/intent a form of organized crime or corrupt intent in its various forms?

What is electronic surveillance?

Electronic surveillance is a broad term used to describe when

someone watches another person's actions or monitors a person's conversations without his/her

knowledge or consent by using one or more electronic devices or platforms. In a relationship where there is domestic violence or stalking, an abuser may use recording and surveillance technology to "keep tabs" on you (the victim) by monitoring your whereabouts and conversations. The motive for using

electronic surveillance may be to maintain power and control over you, to make it hard for you to have any privacy or a life separate from the abuser, and/or to try to discover (and stop) any plans you may be making to leave the abuser. Electronic

surveillance can be done by misusing cameras, recorders, wiretaps,

social media, or email. It can also include the misuse of monitoring software (also known as spyware), which can be installed on a computer, tablet, or a smartphone to secretly monitor the device activity without the user's knowledge. Spyware can allow the abusive person access to everything on the phone, as well as the ability to

intercept and listen in on phone calls.

If the person is not part of the activity or conversation: There are several criminal laws that address the act of listening in on a private conversation,

electronically recording a person's conversation, or videotaping a person's activities. The names of these laws vary across the country, but they often include

wiretap, voyeurism, interception, and other recording laws.

When deciding which law(s) may apply to your situation, this may often depend on the

circumstances of the surveillance and whether you had a "reasonable expectation of privacy" while the abuser recorded or observed you.

Legally, a reasonable

expectation of privacy exists when you are in a situation where an average person would expect to not be seen or spied on.¹ For example, a person in certain public places such as in a football stadium or on a main street may not reasonably have an expectation of privacy, but a person in his/her bedroom or in a public restroom stall generally would.

1See Katz v. United States, 389 U.S. 347 (1967) (noting that “what a person knowingly exposes to the public, even in his own home or office, is not a subject of Fourth Amendment protection. But what he seeks to preserve as private, even in an area accessible to the public, may be constitutionally protected.”)

INVASION OF PRIVACY / VOYEURISM

Invasion of privacy laws can apply to situations where an abuser misuses technology, such as a surveillance device, in order to observe, monitor, or record your personal or private activities. This may include taking nude or partially nude photos or videos without your consent. It can also include when an intimate partner secretly videotapes sexual acts without the consent of his/her partner. Voyeurism refers to the act of spying on someone for sexual pleasure. Voyeurism does not always include videotaping or the use of electronic devices (it may apply to physically spying on someone), but the act of videotaping your sexual activity (or nudity) without your consent and knowledge could fall under the crime of

voyeurism if there is no “invasion of privacy” law in your state.

- *On several occasions during the 2022 NFL season sports anchors would make references to my person while live on air in regards to me showering etc. or make indirect comments towards private areas, hinting that my bathing habits were also being monitored.*

What is spyware?

Spyware is monitoring software that can be used to secretly monitor a device's activity

without the user's knowledge. Spyware can be installed on a:

- computer;
- tablet;
- smartphone; or
- other devices.

Spyware can allow an abuser access to everything on your device, as well as the ability to record and listen in on phone calls or other communications. Spyware software may be hidden on a device, and generally does not give a notification that the software has been installed or is in use. It can be hard to find spyware once it is installed and also hard to remove from a device.

● *From 2020 up to and throughout the present year of 2023 it was and has been acknowledged on numerous occasions and shown in several instances that these methods were used by The Respondent The Walt disney Company and it's counterparts either through assisting in the act of, participating and or encouraging its viewing network to engage in these activities.*

● *It is also shown how these methods were used while using public library computers(ref.(green v. Kansas city public library-Waldo branch USCA 22-2469, green v. Kansas city public library- trails west branch USCA 22-2468, green v. midwest genealogy Center USCA 22-1915, green v. schweitzer Brentwood branch library USCA 22-1906).*

● *It was also shown how these methods were used to control,intercept,interrupt and disconnect mobile services as well. During this whole ordeal to date; I have had 4 mobile Phones, laptops and a tablet compromised in addition to the monitoring of my browsing activity while using Public library computers.*

Unlawful Surveillance in the Second Degree

A person is guilty of unlawful surveillance in the second

degree when: 1. For his or her own, or another person's amusement,

entertainment, or profit, or for the purpose of degrading or abusing a

person, he or she intentionally uses or installs, or permits the utilization or

installation of an imaging device to surreptitiously view, broadcast or record a

person dressing or undressing or the sexual or other intimate

parts of such person at a place and time when such person has a

reasonable expectation of privacy, without such person's knowledge or

consent;

- *The petitioner stated on several occasions that the surveillance and monitoring of his person was non consensual and that he was “Not Ok with this” and unaware of this breach, once finding out did everything within his Power to alert and stop this incident consistently from 2020 to present 2023.*

2. For his or her own, or another individual's amusement,

entertainment, profit, sexual arousal or gratification, or for the

purpose of degrading or abusing a person, the actor intentionally uses

or installs or permits the utilization or installation of an imaging

device to surreptitiously view, broadcast, or record such person in an

identifiable manner:

- For the purposes of this subdivision, when a person uses or installs, or

permits the utilization or installation of an imaging device in a

bedroom, changing room, fitting room, restroom, toilet,

bathroom, washroom, shower

or any room assigned to guests or patrons in a hotel, motel or inn,

there is a rebuttable presumption that such person did so for no

legitimate Purpose; or Without the knowledge or consent of a person,

- at a place and time when such person has a reasonable expectation of privacy, without such person's knowledge or consent.

Unlawful surveillance in the second degree is a class E felony

- *Methods of surveillance were used in many ways for exploitation purposes, as well as amusement and defamation. Throughout the course of this issue it has been shown how The respondent and its counterparts used surveillance footage to harass, humiliate and entertain its viewing audience as well as predict the appellants future endeavors in hopes to derail and/or control.*

- *These findings were also used to inspire show criteria and the creation and innovation of new revenue streams such as new shows and ideas spaining from movies,shows, health innovation, implemented into the marketing and advertising of products leading to unjust enrichment etc..*

Non-consensual monitoring and surveillance of someone

-Installation of Viewing Device

- *This element means that you either physically installed a viewing device yourself, or had someone install a viewing device on your behalf. A key part of this element is that you installed this viewing device without providing notice or obtaining the consent of the viewer or recorded person.*

- This method of concealed surveillance, monitoring and data tracking was unknown to the petitioner until television personnel alerted the petitioner of this matter showing that this was unknown and non consensual. The petitioner made several attempts to alert networks/broadcasters of the monetary issue and was ignored and the problem was neglected. The petitioner also reached out to consumer affairs regarding the monitoring and data problem and still saw no resolution. In 2022 the appellant reached out personally to the Respondent The Walt disney company and still received no response.

-The respondent The Walt Disney company was aware of multiple viewing devices that were used to surveil and monitor the petitioner including in private dwelling place(s) including surveillance methods through television electronic capabilities and neglected to address such issues even after being notified by the petitioner personally as well as through legal proceedings; The respondent and it's counterpart having knowledge of these claims denied involvement and openly stated the petitioner falsely exaggerated allegations.

The "American Data Privacy and Protection Act (ADPPA) Federal Consumer Online Privacy Rights" for instance, prove to be clearly violated in many ways such as the Consumer Privacy Protection Act of 2017, This bill amends the federal criminal code to make it a crime to intentionally and willfully conceal knowledge of a security breach that results in economic harm of at least \$1,000 to any individual.

- While acknowledging monitoring capabilities through television. As the petitioner was inbetween living spaces in 2021 and moved between different residences in 2022 it was acknowledged that other forms of surveillance was being used to maintain constant viewing of his person and daily habits which confirm several forms of stalking and assisted, encouraged and the participation in the act of tracking and controlling one's movement without consent for ulterior motives.

Viewing the sexual/intimate areas of a person

- This element means that the viewing or recording device was set up in a place where people would be undressing and/or engaging in

sexual acts with the assumption of privacy. It is important to note that it does not matter why the viewing or recording device was set up, or what motivated the person viewing or recording the footage.

- Throughout the course of this ordeal there were mentions of actions done while bathing or in the bathroom of my dwelling place. Which also confirms that some form of surveillance was in this area as well. Which also indicated invasion of privacy violations. This also was true for instances in the petitioners bedroom

as well.

Reasonable Privacy

- *The definition of Element 3 is the installation of the viewing device in a place where the viewer or recorded person had a reasonable expectation of privacy.*

- *This element means that the viewing or recording device was set up in a place where the recorded person felt that they could undress privately. This includes private residences, but also places that are generally expected to be private, such as bathrooms and changing rooms.*

S 250.55, which covers the dissemination of an unlawful surveillance image in the second degree. This covers intentionally distributing an image that was obtained through unlawful surveillance, as defined above.

S 250.60 It applies to anyone who is convicted of disseminating unlawful surveillance images more than once in a ten year period. This applies to any time an image or video that was knowingly obtained through

unlawful surveillance changes hands between two or more people. Any time you share, post, or otherwise spread the image, and you are liable for the dissemination of unlawful surveillance images.

Eavesdropping

-The definition of eavesdropping is intentionally overhearing or recording a conversation without consent, by means of a mechanical device.

Eavesdropping means any time that you intentionally access a private conversation between two or more people. This can mean the interception of electronic communications, like emails, texts, or phone calls, but it can also refer to recording conversations two people have in person with a reasonable expectation of privacy.

- *Since 2020 up to the present year of 2023, there has been a constant and gradual chain of events that show that several methods were used to carry out the act of eavesdropping. It was stated on numerous occasions that the monitoring of my person has been occurring unknowingly for an additional 10-12 years. Through this malfunction the respondent has enabled it's staf to carry out countless acts of malice that has undoubtedly af ected and in many ways impacted and altered the course of my life.*

- *On countless occasions tv personnel openly exhibited how numerous methods of eavesdropping were executed while taking advantage of this neglected television malfunction. Through this monetary method tv personnel were able to openly view the respondents personal life at their leisure, openly broadcast these personal findings to multiple viewing networks, openly intrude on private matters by encouraging scenarios, recommending and insisting actions. Through this electronic error the petitioner was individually targeted, controlled and eavesdropping and spyware were used to gather insight and avoid recourse. Through this, unlimited access which has accumulated profit in numerous ways and has been used to manipulate outcomes in their favor and gradually gain and obtain electronic control through study trial and error.*

- *Since 2020 up to the present year 2023, the respondent the Walt disney company and its counterparts have assisted, participated as well as encouraged the act of Eavesdropping in numerous various scenarios. This has been shown by*

distributing illegally gathered information throughout its viewing audiences/network through direct communication, repeating verbatim specific incidents, show criteria and data transmissions.

- *This information was shown to be used for intentional malice towards the petitioner and to manipulate outcomes in the respondents favor.*

Aggravated Harassment in the Second Degree

-Aggravated harassment in the second degree is communicating with the intent to threaten, to such an extent that another person would reasonably fear for their 19 safety, the safety of their property, or the safety of their family members.

-In this context, aggravated harassment could be charged if an image obtained through unlawful surveillance is used to threaten harm. This could include threatening the livelihood of a person.

● *For over 3 years non consensually the petitioner has endured tv personalities openly viewing his person in real time, mocking, jokes, violations of the privacy in the sanctity of his own home, the gathering and collection of his daily habits which has caused tremendous hardship in everyday things such as shopping, stable employment, constant compromises to social media, mobile devices and financials, numerous retaliation acts, the constant ridicule from network followings for attempting to pursue legal recourse to resolve this issue that has been concealed and hidden. Through this manufacturing error this ongoing surveillance has also affected health, relationships, family matters, social stature, business and career.*

● *The respondent The Walt Disney company and its counterparts held discussions about projected and preplanned expiration dates in regards to my person while live on air. While exhibiting other abusive behavior and harassing misconduct such as scenarios or hints at methods and plots of retaliation.* ●

This harassment also included affecting financial standings through orchestration of interruption in employment, causing financial strain

and potential loss of opportunity or endeavors.

- *The harassment I endured also affected my mental and emotional health*

- *Also by disconnecting me from local viewing programs in attempts to cover up actions instead of addressing incidents, made me feel single out and purposely targeted.*

- *By the respondent participating and encouraging the act of monitoring shopping and culinary choices placed strain on my physical health and caused food safety issues which ultimately deprived me of proper nutrition due to limitations and controlling food choices in my shopping area. This ordeal proved to be time consuming, aided in encouraging the act of price gouging, the manipulation of or limited shopping options as a form of sovereignty.*

(REF. 18 U.S. Code § 1038 - False information and hoaxes)

. (b) Civil Action.—Whoever engages in any conduct with intent to convey false or misleading information under circumstances where such information may reasonably be believed and where such information indicates that an activity has taken, is taking, or will take place that would constitute a violation of chapter 2, 10, 11B, 39, 40, 44, 111, or

113B of this title, section 236 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2284), or section 46502, the second sentence of section 46504, section 46505 (b)(3) or (c), section 46506 if homicide or attempted homicide is involved, or section 60123(b) of title 49 is liable in a civil action to any party incurring expenses incident to any emergency or investigative response to that conduct, for those expenses.

(c) Reimbursement.—

(1) In general.—The court, in imposing a sentence on a defendant who has

been convicted of an offense under subsection (a), shall order the defendant to reimburse any state or local government, or private not-for-profit organization that provides fire or rescue service incurring expenses incident to any emergency or investigative response to that conduct, for those expenses. (2) Liability.—A person ordered to make reimbursement under this subsection shall be jointly and severally liable for such expenses with each other person, if any, who is ordered to make reimbursement under this subsection for the same expenses. (3) Civil judgment.—An order of reimbursement under this subsection shall, for the purposes of enforcement, be treated as a civil judgment.

Unethical human experimentation

- *Counterparts of the respondent The Walt Disney Company would often mention several forms of genetic modification.*
- *It is shown how the monitoring of the petitioner's shopping and culinary choices led to issues with food safety which affected specific areas of his body. While enduring these hardships it was shown to be acknowledged by Employees of the respondent The Walt Disney Company while live on air that it was happening by mentions of food or areas of the body or actions. These food safety occurrences were also documented through state health complaint portals. By the careful monitoring and studying of shopping choices it was shown how this data was then used to predict and control/limit the petitioner's diet.*

Impactful Cases

There are several impactful cases when it comes to unlawful surveillance.

- In 2007, Peter Barta, a public defender at the Legal Aid Society, was charged with taking video footage of his female coworkers while they were undressing. He was ultimately convicted of the felony charge (unlawful surveillance in the second degree) and disbarred.
- Another high-profile case happened in 2013. Colgate University student Michael J. Piznarski had a sexual encounter with a woman

which he secretly recorded. He then threatened to publicly release the recording if the woman didn't have sex with him again. Ultimately, she relented, and he secretly recorded that encounter as well. The woman went to the police, and an investigation and trial proceeded. Piznarski was convicted, among other things, of two counts of unlawful surveillance in the second degree. He was sentenced to 1-3 years in prison and permanently placed on the sex offender registry.

- *The respondent denied claims and stated that there was a contract that made the monitoring and exploitation of my person permissible.*

In this suit I clearly show that I did not give consent nor did I enter into any form of agreement with the respondent. Even after contacting consumer affairs

as well as the respondent personally these actions still continued without being addressed. It was even stated that "Control What we can control".

Further showing the respondent The Walt Disney Company's negligence, corrupt intent, racketeer influenced acts and malice

Reasons For Granting the Writ

The court should grant Writ of Certiorari in this case because Paramount abused its media power by using unconventional methods within its network to carry out organized plots and racketeer influenced acts.

The court should grant review in this case to oversee lawful integrity, examine factual findings that further exhibit a collective working in regards to relative cases regarding similar incidents.

Weighing whether these actions were intentional and meant to target and cause unforeseen hardship and/or Malice to the petitioner.

Furthermore, to examine the question of how this breach in privacy happened, why the petitioner is being targeted and lastly why after 3 years and after numerous warnings from employee personnel as well as the petitioner has the respondent nor any of its counterparts or partnerships neglected to come forth to acknowledge the situation or work to end this electronic breach, With no response to complaints from The petitioner nor attempts to find a way to end the surveillance and correct behavior, these

neglected actions have led to escalated matters that the respondent the Walt Disney Company can now not control which is why they are in fact liable. The United States court of appeals for the ninth

circuit ruled on September 27, 2023 that appeal 23-55358 Green v. The Walt Disney company be dismissed due to lack of an arguable basis either in law or in

fact. It is argued that the breach in the television was used as a platform to carry out continued uncontrollable malice towards the appellant as well as other ulterior motives such as using television electronic capabilities as well as taking advantage of other surveillance vulnerabilities to aid in the concealed act of racketeering, exploitation, defamation of one's character etc. No contractual agreement was made between the petitioner and the respondent, nor was there any form of compensation for the time (3 years and counting) the appellant has 32

endured this; Whereas employees of the respondent Paramount are compensated for their time on air as employees of the entertainment and media industry labeled as anchors, reporters, sports commentators, musicians, television personnel etc. The petitioner on the other hand carries none of these labels nor is employed by any television organization. The petitioner is a consumer, one that views the content that is provided by the respondent The Walt Disney company for entertainment purposes. Actions committed by staff of the respondent The Walt Disney Company violated both company policies as well as laws, statutes and network regulations. By unconventionally using data and spyware capabilities the appellee violates several privacy laws and constitutional rights. Without having a formal proceeding, and solely basing a final decision on briefs and documents submitted by the petitioner, enables the ability to prevent the respondent The Walt Disney Company from having to take responsibility and confirm facts and/or examine the integrity of its company and staff pertaining to rules of professional conduct. As a consumer The United States has various consumer privacy acts that are put in place as data protection laws. The “American Data Privacy and Protection Act (ADPPA) Federal Consumer Online Privacy Rights” for instance, prove to be clearly violated in many ways such as the Consumer Privacy Protection Act of 2017, This bill amends the federal criminal code to make it a crime to intentionally and willfully conceal knowledge of a security breach that results in economic harm of at least \$1,000 to any individual. Since the year 2020 it has been described how methods have been used to derail and control career and financial advancement. While it has been shown and proven that the respondent The walt disney company knowingly took advantage of spyware and data hacking methods that has resulted in hardship, pain and suffering towards the petitioner and furthermore has been exploited through television content while all allegations have been denied and made out to be frivolous. While the docket entries show several submissions from the appellant,

The case has been decided without the courts even requesting a response to the argument presented towards the respondent The Walt Disney Company. Though subpoenas were issued for review of many entertainment segments where said incidents occurred in the instance allegations were denied as standard cause for investigative examination/due cause (under rule 11); The petitioner has laid a basis for factual incidents and laws violated, even if the appellant fails to correctly state the precise laws, rules and statutes violated but gives sufficient accounts of incidents that due in fact violate rules, regulations, laws and statutes regarding such matters; Is it not the courts duty or give valid reason to acknowledge laws that are

33

violated based on the jurisdiction of the subject matter?(rule 2.2) (Fed.R.civilProc. 12(b)(1) Through the constant invasion and intrusion of the respondents privacy, the respondent The Walt Disney Company has exhibited acts of sovereignty, unlawful Surveillance, voyeurism, eavesdropping, exploitation, malice and the participation in racketeering influenced acts and other corrupt intent.

Relief

Injunctive Relief in the amount of \$175,000,000.00

- Pain and suffering
- Theft of intellectual property
- Eavesdropping, use of spyware and and other monetary actions
- Encouraging the act of stalking
- Intrusion of privacy
- Compromising personal and business affairs leading to leaked trade secrets, unfair business practices, unjust enrichment.
- Voyeurism
- Abuse of power
- Professional misconduct
- Harassment
- Malice
- Violation of the privacy consumer act

- Violation of the electronic data act
- Violation of the consumer data act
- Exploitation
- Racketeer influenced activity
- Abusive misconduct
- Mental abuse and emotional distress
- Defamation and assassination of one's character
- retaliation
- The petitioner Request a written and signed apology from the respondentThe Walt disney company and all its counterparts involved.
- Unjust Enrichment

Conclusion

The petitioner Courtney Green respectfully asks that the court issue a Writ of 31 Certiorari in United States Court of Appeals case 23-55358 Green v. The Walt Disney company.

Respectfully Submitted,

Courtney Green

Petitioner

P.o. Box 22444

Kansas City, Mo 64113