


No. 23-7466



IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
PRO SE PETITIONER

BEATRICE M. UWAMARIYA PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

ENIAS BAGANIZI — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

ERROR BY
(RIVERSIDE APP) THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA SUPREME
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE) COURT

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

BEATRICE M. UWAMARIYA
(Your Name)

11055 Alamo Rd,
(Address)

Loma Linda, CA 92354
(City, State, Zip Code)

909 893-9090
(Phone Number)

Questions Presented.

1.Honorable Chief Justice Guerrero, of the California Supreme Court, Case S 283118, and the 3 Judges Panels, of the State of California, Riverside Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate, Second Division by ignoring the laws, facts, evidence's, misapplied Opinion, filed on November 13, 2023, P.2, (L1-2)? "Law Office of Indu Srivastav, and Indu Srivastav for Respondent, Enias Baganizi. No Appearance for Respondent ". By affirming Honorable Temporary Judge Charles M.Fuertsch, Final Court Order, they failed to apply *Cal. Code Civ. Proc. 473 (d)*. A Judgement void on its face, due to no Court Appearance of Respondent, is subject to be Set aside at any time, and for U.S Supreme Court to apply *Rule 55. Default: Default Judgment; Federal Rule of Civil Procedure, and Rule 60: Relief from a Judgement or order, all applies (except 5), Federal Rule of Civil Procedure?* (CR. P.41-L15 to L21) a). Can Congress apply the fourteenth Amendment to State Officers, State Court Judges, individuals, when they act Under Color of Law? b) Does a State Court have the authority to defy the orders of the United States Supreme Courts?

2.May the United States Department of Justice, internationally extradite (defined as an obligation imposed by *article IV of the U.S Constitution*), for Unauthorized Laws Practice, Crimes of laundering and stealing innocent Californians Resident moneys for 23 years; Petitioner moneys included, white collar-crime, for Ms. Indu Srivastav to be fingerprinted to know who she is really. She has been appealing Online, and on Video Call, using India IP Address, with India Coordinates, no one has seen her, because Ms. Srivastav has never set foot in California, to pass the State of California Bar Exam. Through fraud, false claims, she obtained a Law License # 208438?

LIST OF PARTIES

[x] 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:

RELATED CASES

None

TABLE OF CONTENTS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW	P.1
OPINIONS BELOW	P. 1
JURISDICTION	P. 4-5 8
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED ...	P. 9
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	P. 9
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	P. 22
CONCLUSION	P. 27

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Petition for review Denied by the State of California, Supreme Court.

APPENDIX B: Opinion of the Fourth Appellate, Second Division, Riverside Court of Appeals, Denying Petition for Rehearing.

APPENDIX C: Opinion of the Fourth Appeals, Second Division, Riverside Court of Appeal.

APPENDIX D: Minute Court Order Honorable Judge Diana Renteria of 9/3/2021

APPENDIX E: Final Court Order Honorable Judge Charles M. Fuertsch: 10/7/21

APPENDIX F: Corrected Minute Court Order Honorable Judge Charles M. Fuertsch

APPENDIX G: Honorable Judge Charles M. Fuertsch new order preventing Petitioner to file for Reconsideration.

APPENDIX H: Corrected Minute Order Honorable Judge Charles Fuertsch, 4/4/2022

APPENDIX I: Final Court Order Honorable Judge Charles Fuertsch, 4/13/2022

APPENDIX J: Mr. Enias Baganizi Payroll Statement For 16 Dec-2021 to 31-Dec-2021, with Child Support Services Request for order review, Income and Expenses.

And World Bank explanatory letter of taxes, and Ms. Musabe Job at World Bank

APPENDIX K: Mr. Enias Baganizi Income and Expense Declaration 1/7/2022

APPENDIX L: State Bar of California Email, with Ms. Indu Srivastav signatures

APPENDIX M: July 30, 2010, Divorce Decree, Only Judgement. No Original wet signature of Honorable Judge Tara Reilly filed in Court Records

APPENDIX N: Responsive declaration Mr. Baganizi 1/22/2009, with his 2 divorces

APPENDIX O: Minute Court Order of November 30th, 2021, Honorable Judge Steven J. Singley, which was addressed previously by The State of California Riverside Appeal Court, and issued Opinion and a Remittitur, which constitute Fraud on the Court knowing only Final Judge

Court Order can be addressed by Appeal Court to receive Opinion, and Remittitur. A Minute Court Order shouldn't receive a Review by The Supreme Court of California, which constitutes a miscarriage of Justice. To make Mr. Baganizi win a case he has been Defrauding Petitioner, for Petitioner owed moneys to be laundered overseas, to be divided among all the one who has acquitted Mr. Baganizi. The Department of Child Support Services, has Jurisdiction, but has refused to address, a Court Minute Order

APPENDIX P: Divers: Petitioner MRI.

APPENDIX Q: Mr.Baganizi email translated. Mr. Baganizi

APPENDIX S: Mr. Baganizi Approval notice Immigration

APPENDIX T: Collected Moneys from Social Services on nephews adopted illegally, and United Nations, Paho, Mr. Baganizi Embezzlement letter.

APPENDIX V: Supreme Court Clerk Extension letter.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

In People v. Dunn, 201 Cal.App.2d 269, 274, (Pen. Code. § 281). P.

In re Marriage of Ramirez, 81 Cal. Rprt.3d 180,186 (Cal Ct, App. 2008) P.

[No. E009595. Fourth Dist., Div. Two. Feb. 8, 1993.]

Common White-Collar crime: The Enron Scandal and the Bernie Madoff Ponzi scheme serve as stark reminders of the destructive potential of white-collar crimes.

STATUTES AND RULES.

BPC 6125 & 6126 Unauthorized Practice of Law in Ca....P.16

Bus. & Prof. Code § 6068.7, (g).....P.6,17,18

<i>Rule 1.1 Competence. State Bar of Ca (.gov).....</i>	<i>P.17</i>
<i>Rule 1.1 Competence (a), (b), (c), (d).....</i>	<i>P.17</i>
<i>(Rule Approved by the Supreme Court, Effective November 1, 2018)</i>	
<i>Rule 3.3 Candor Toward the Tribunal.....</i>	<i>P.17</i>
<i>(Rule Approved by the Supreme Court, Effective November 1, 2018)</i>	<i>Rule 4.1</i>
<i>Truthfulness in Statements to Others.....</i>	<i>P.17</i>
<i>(Rule Approved by the Supreme Court, Effective November 1, 2018)</i>	
<i>Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 473 (d). No Court Appearance.....</i>	<i>P.1, P.</i>
<i>Cal Family Law § 2251 (a) Putative wife status.....</i>	<i>P.15</i>
<i>Fam. Code §2255 Grant Attorney Fees to a Putative wife in Annulment cases.</i>	<i>P.5,15</i>
<i>Cal. Fam. Code §2210 (d) Voidable marriage due to fraud, perjury, duress..</i>	<i>P.15</i>
<i>Penal code § 281 Bigamy.....</i>	<i>P.18</i>
<i>Penal code § 518 Extortion P.....</i>	<i>P.16, P.18</i>
<i>Penal code 529 False Impersonation P.....</i>	<i>P.7</i>
<i>Penal Code 470. Filing a false document.....</i>	<i>P. 17</i>

OTHER: Petitioner is kindly Requesting for an Attorney. Did the Lower Court abuse its discretion in denying the right for Counsel, knowing there is discrepancy of income, and this is an Annulment case. Opinion P. 8, (L8-16). Fam. (Code §2255 Grant Attorney Fees to a Putative wife in Annulment cases). The Court may grant Attorney fees and costs in accordance with chapter 3.5 (Commencing with section 2030) of part 1, in proceedings to have the marriage void, and in those proceedings based upon voidable marriage in which the party applying for attorney's fees, and costs is found to be innocent of the fraud marriage.

Before Submitting a Reply, which has been written by fixers, hackers, Petitioner would like to Request for Ms. Indu Srivastav to be fingerprinted to check her criminal record, and all credential needed before passing the Bar exam. Proof of Her business registration, allowing her to represent anyone in California, according to Rule of Professional conduct, (*Code section 6068.7, (g)*), provides that an Attorney shall never “seek to mislead the Judge or any Judicial officer by an artifice or false statement of fact or law”. who gets paid acting as Attorneys, with Ms. Sonia, Lepe, Santos, Paralegal, and Ms. Theresa L. Shortridge.

Since petitioner will not have a fair trial, ruling, in San Bernardino County, Petitioner would like to request for Change of Venue. And Petitioner is kindly requesting for a Judge in Washington DC, near the World Bank International who has previously ruled, on World Bank Employees cases, not paying taxes.

**IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

OPINIONS BELOW

[] For cases from **federal courts**:

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

☐ reported at _____; or,

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

☐ Is unpublished.

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

☐ reported at _____; or,

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

☐ Is unpublished.

☒ For cases from **state courts:**

The opinion of the **highest state court to review the merits appears at**
Appendix A to the petition and is; or

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

☐ reported at

☒ is unpublished.

The opinion of the **Court of Appeals, Riverside State of California, Fourth Appellate, Second Division** appears at Appendix B to the petition and is

☐ reported at _____; or,

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

☒ is unpublished.

JURISDICTION

☐ For cases from **federal courts**:

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

☐ No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

☐ A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals, on the following date: _____ and, a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____

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

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

☒ For cases from **state courts**:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was **February,14,2024**.

A copy of that decision appears at Appendix A

☒ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date:

November 29, 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) from March 11, 2024 to May 10, 2024 (date) to Correct in Application

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

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

<i>Article IV of the U.S Constitution (Internationally Extradition)....</i>	<i>P.16</i>
<i>The Fourteenth Amendment,§1(Due Process, Equal Protection).P.19,24</i>	
<i>Fourteenth Amendment, Section 5.....</i>	<i>P. 13</i>
<i>Fourteenth Amendment, Section 5.2</i>	<i>P.13</i>
<i>U.S Court Rule 55. Default Judgement</i>	<i>P.1,11.</i>
<i>U.S Court Rule 60. Relief from a Judgement or order.....</i>	<i>P.11,12</i>
<i>18 U.S Code § 241- Conspiracy against rights.....</i>	<i>P.11,12,25</i>
<i>18 U.S. Code § 242 - Deprivation of rights under color of law..</i>	<i>P.11,12,25</i>
<i>18 U.S Code 3492 Commission to Consular Officers to Authenticate Foreign Documents.....</i>	<i>P.12, 18, 30</i>
<i>18 U.S. Code § 1951(a)(b)(2). Interference with commerce by threats or violence</i>	<i>P. 16</i>
<i>28 U.S. Code § 455.....</i>	<i>P. 22, 30</i>

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Honorable Chief Justice Guerrero, of the California Supreme Court, Case S283118, Honorable Presiding Judge Ramirez, Honorable Judge Miller, and Honorable Judge Fields, Riverside Court of Appeal, State of California Fourth Appellate, Second Division, by ignoring the laws, facts, evidence's, misapplied Opinion, filed on November 13, 2023, P.2, (L1-2)? "Law Office of Indu Srivastav, and Indu Srivastav for Respondent, Enias Baganizi. No Appearance for

Respondent". By affirming Honorable Temporary Judge Charles M. Fuertsch, Final Court Order, they failed to apply *Cal. Code Civ. Proc. 473 (d)*. A Judgement void on its face, due to no Court Appearance of Respondent, is subject to be Set aside at any time, and for U.S Supreme Court to apply *Rule 55. Default: Default Judgment; Federal Rule of Civil Procedure, and Rule 60: Relief from a Judgement or order, all applies (except 5)*. (*U.S. Const. Amend. XIV, § 1(Due Process, Equal Protection)*), *18 U.S Code § 241-Conspiracy against rights.18 U.S. Code § 242 - Deprivation of rights under color of law*.

On January 08, 2024, The State of California San Bernardino Superior Court records, public servants working in Court records told Petitioner, "They do not have Original Wet signature on Petitioner and Respondent Divorce Decree, only judgement, of July 2010, of Honorable Judge Tara Reilly filed in their Court record. They signature they have is a falsified, forged with marks on, not from Judge Reilly chamber, and without our Child name on it. Which constitute Fraud on the Court. To acknowledge their statement, they applied a Certified Stamp, and told me to go ask an Attorney what to do next, instead of hiring a Handwriting forensic expert, since Petitioner Have fee waiver, the Court hasn't contacted Petitioner, to correct the Fraud on the Court committed by Respondent and his Attorney at time, knowing Respondent has left Petitioner destitute, unable to afford an Attorney.

Apparently, when they noticed, someone else has signed Judge Reilly signature, instead of correcting the Fraud on the Court, by calling Petitioner, the San Bernardino Court Administration, and the Court Attorneys, moved Honorable Judge Tara Reilly to San Bernardino Probate Court. (*U.S Court Rule 60. Relief from a Judgement or order, 18 U.S Code § 241-Conspiracy against rights, 18 U.S. Code § 242 - Deprivation of rights under color of law*)

And recently it happened again, in Petitioner case, when public servants working in Court records found out, there is no Substitution of Attorney filed in Family Court records, no power of Attorney allowing Ms. Indu Srivastav, an overseas telemarketing who only appear to Court using IP Address from India, and Court Coordinates from India, to be on Mr. Enias Baganizi working overseas, out of Country, who has refused to sign, to be represented by Attorney Srivastav, without a Contract between both of them. Mr. Baganizi does not have no case! Which constitute a miscarriage of Justice. Once again, the Court Administration, and Court Attorneys, moved Honorable Judge Steven J. Singley to San Bernardino Criminal Court, in Rancho Cucamonga, instead of letting Petitioner know, and address the Fraud on the Court.

Judge Singley has allowed an Overseas Attorney on a case without checking the legality of her Substitution of Attorney and has started a case without merit. All her briefs, all her Court allegation's, her Court declaration must be legally challenged in Court of Law, to be void and Null. Mr. Baganizi cannot win this case of his fraud, and of Ms. Srivastav fraud on the Court. *(U.S Court Rule 60. Relief from a Judgement or order, 18 U.S Code § 241- Conspiracy against rights. 18U.S. Code § 242 - Deprivation of rights under color of law, 18 U.S Code 3492 Commission to Consular Officers to Authenticate Foreign Documents).*

a). Can Congress apply the fourteenth Amendment to State Officers, State Court Judges, individuals, when they act Under Color of Law? The answer is Yes. Amdt 14.S5.2 Who Congress May Regulate: Fourteenth Amendment, Section 5: *The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.*

“In enforcing by appropriate legislation the Fourteenth Amendment guarantees against state denials, Congress has the discretion to adopt remedial measures, such as authorizing

persons being denied their civil rights in state courts to remove their cases to federal courts,¹ and to provide criminal² and civil³ liability for state officials and agents⁴ or persons associated with them⁵ who violate protected rights. These statutory measures designed to eliminate discrimination under color of law⁶ lacks such language. The newest statute, 18 U.S.C. § 245, contains, of course, no such language. On the meaning of custom as used in the under color of phrase, *see* *Adickes v. S.H. Kress & Co.*, 398 U.S. 144 (1970). present no problems of constitutional foundation, although there may well be other problems of application.⁷ But the Reconstruction Congresses did not stop with statutory implementation of rights guaranteed against state infringement, moving as well against private interference.

Thus, in the Civil Rights Act of 1875⁸ Congress had proscribed private racial discrimination in the admission to and use of inns, public conveyances, theaters, and other places of public amusement. The *Civil Rights Cases*⁹ found this enactment to be beyond Congress's power to enforce the Fourteenth Amendment. The Court observed that Section 1 prohibited only state action and did not reach private conduct. Therefore, Congress's power under Section 5 to enforce Section 1 by appropriate legislation was held to be similarly limited. It does not invest Congress with power to legislate upon subjects which are within the domain of State legislation; but to provide modes of relief against State legislation, or State action, of the kind referred to. It does not authorize Congress to create a code of municipal law for the regulation of private rights; but to provide modes of redress against the operation of State laws, and the action of State officers executive or judicial, when these are subversive of the fundamental rights specified in the amendment.¹⁰ The holding in this case had already been preceded by *United States v.*

*Cruikshank*¹¹ and by *United States v. Harris*¹² in which the Federal Government had prosecuted individuals for killing and injuring African Americans. The Amendment did not increase the power of the Federal Government vis-a-vis individuals, the Court held, only with regard to the states themselves.¹³.....etc.”

b) Does a State have authority to defy orders of the U.S. Courts? The answer is No.

Federal Preemption. “When state law and federal law conflict, federal law displaces, or preempts, state law, due to the Supremacy Clause of the Constitution. U.S. Const. art. VI, § 2. Preemption applies regardless of whether the conflicting laws come from legislatures, courts, administrative agencies, or constitutions”. All Courts, federal and State, are bound by the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court on U.S. Constitutional and other issues of federal law. And, as the final arbiter of the law, the Supreme Court is charged with ensuring the American people, the promise of equal justice under law and, thereby, also functions as guardian, and interpreter of the Constitution”.

Honorable Chief Justice Guerrero, of the California Supreme Court, Case S283118, Honorable Presiding Judge Ramirez, Honorable Judge Miller, and Honorable Judge Fields, Riverside Court of Appeal, State of California Fourth Appellate, Second Division, Honorable Judge Steven Singley, Temporary Judge Charles, M. Fuertsch, violated Petitioner and family Civil rights, human rights, we have been discriminated against, abusing their authority and power, and have emotionally broken all of us, living with PTSD, Petitioner has been going through therapy to survive injustices, done to her and her family for over 21 years. Petitioner who is still legally Married with Respondent was refused an advance from Respondent to hire an Attorney, according to (*Family Code § 2255*), for justice and fairness, even the California State Judge have

proof, that Respondent has defrauded them of a Legal Marriage, and of a Divorce decree, only judgment, using corruption, and bribery, deceit. Mr. Baganizi entering a marriage in San Bernardino, California, a sacred union without legal divorce documents, without respect, without love, without morals and integrity, knowing he is a still married man, has violated Petitioner, and 2 minors, constitutional rights, Civil rights, Human rights, and must be held accountable. (*Family Code §2210(d), Family Code §2251(a)*). As a Putative wife, Innocent spouse Petitioner has right to Annulment, plus half of his salaries and benefits, retirement, savings, property division from January 1st, 2008.

Respondent has committed fraud, lying under oath for 11 years, providing his two weeks salaries as his monthly salaries, which is perjury, misrepresentation, fraud. Respondent owes moneys in Arrears= \$1,142,000.00, due to fraud Respondent has committed for 11 years. Using his December 2021, salaries \$415,310.00 x 25 % = 103,827.5, divide by 12 months = \$8,652.00 per month x 11 years. Respondent paid only \$1,198.00 for 8 years, and \$2,214.00 for 3 years, which was used for our son Christian education. Our son has right to live as his other children. Respondent failed by fraud to disclose that one of the privileges of being an Employee of World Bank, is that He does not pay Taxes, and Child Support is being paid up to age 25 years old when child is in school, unless when Child is disabled goes up to 32 years old. Change of Status From 03.06 Family Obligations- Spouse and (or) Child Support Obligations and Divorce; World Bank International. Most of Petitioner, as Custodian Parent, belong to my late husband life savings, life insurance, to help raise his sons decently, from my brothers, sisters' loans, Petitioner mutual funds, savings, School loans, and from my son, a U.S. Naval Officer, working tirelessly to protect our Country, earnings, savings, which must be repaid. Mr. Baganizi after making sure he injured my back, and neck nerves, to be living with Fibromyalgia, not able to work to afford

Court representation has been forcing my family to pay their wages, savings, helping Petitioner to financially support our son since he was a toddler, keep ends meet, nothing saved for 21 years, no retirement, no savings, no house, no reliable transportation for Petitioner, and our son. Hiring fixers, hackers to destroys my cars. *(18 U.S. Code § 1951 (a)(b)(2), Interference with Commerce, by treats or violence)*

It has been numerous Injustices in this case, because of the number of money Respondent owes, promising to give to anyone acquitting him, and San Bernardino County being one of the poorest County in U.S.A. And Respondent has previously told Petitioner with his brother present in 2010, and in 2015, when he came to court, that he will only pay Attorneys, and anyone who will acquit him, and it is what he has been doing for 13 years. *(Penal code §518, Extortion, Penal code § 529, Impersonation)*

2. May the United States Department of Justice Internationally extradite (defined as an obligation imposed by *(article IV of the U.S Constitution)*), Ms. Indu Srivastav a telemarketing Online, on Video Call only, using India IP Address, with India Coordinates doing Unlawful Court representation for 23 years, in California. No one has seen her in Court, because Ms. Srivastav has never set foot in California, to take, and pass the State of California, Bar Exam. Through fraud, false claims, she obtained a Law License # 208438. **Yes** *(Bus. Prof. Code §6068 (g), State Bar Rule 3.3, Candor toward the tribunal, State Bar Rule 4.1 Truthfulness to others, (California), State Bar Rule 1.1 Competence)*

According to the California State Bar, there is no Family Law Office of Stephens Kray Attorney ever Licensed in California. Ms. Srivastav did not work under his umbrella for 3 years from 2000, which is the only way she could be allowed to take the California State Bar exam, with unchecked foreigner's Law education, at Pradesh Law University which opened its door in

2016. According to the Los Angeles Times, a newspaper which cannot be trusted to be cited, there was a Business Office of Stephens & Kray which had declared Bankruptcy, in 1997, closed permanently in 1998, and most Attorneys who worked in that Businesses, Law Firm, served Court sentences. (*Penal Code 470. Filing a false document*).

In 2000, Ms. Srivastav told untruth when she stated to have worked under Stephens & Kray umbrellas, when she didn't. In 2000, Ms. Srivastav didn't qualify to pass the Bar exam, which she never passed, without being on California soil. All Ms. Srivastav has done is fraud, and fraud on the Court. And according to the India Embassy in Washington DC, there is no one named Indu Srivastav who has practiced Law, in India Database, as a lawyer (Advocate). Ms. Sonia Pele Santos, a Paralegal/ Owner, has been the one writing Briefs, Court declarations, and signing everything, knowing she is not an Attorney. (*Bus. Prof.Code 6068 (g)*). No one should practice law without studying law, and it is a crime to impersonate a lawyer, which constitute (*BPC 6125&6126 Unlawful practice of Law*), felony, misrepresentation Perjury, Fraud, Fraud on the Court, on both Ms. Sonia Lepe Santos, and Ms. Indu Srivastav. (*[No. So57125. Jan5,1998) Birbrower, Montalbano, Condon & Frank, P.C., et al., Petitioners. The Superior Court of Santa Clara County, Respondent: ESQ Business SERVICES, INC., Real Party in interest. No.CV737595).J.*

Mr. Baganizi living overseas has refused to sign, Original, wet, Certified, Exemplified, and authenticated by the U.S State Department according to (*18 U.S Code 3492 Commission to Consular Officers to authenticate foreign documents*), for Ms. Srivastav representation to be valid, in California. And Ms. Srivastav refusal to recuse herself, violated *the due process of the Fourteenth Amendment*. Mr. Baganizi doesn't possess any Family Court Judges wet original,

certified signatures on **his 3 divorces**. Intentionally with premeditation, and malice, he violated Petitioner, and 2 minors, Civil rights, Human rights, and must be held accountable.

By forcing himself into Petitioner's life, He committed bigamy, (*Penal code § 281 Bigamy*), kidnapping by fraud),(Penal code 207), servitude, enslavers, battery, extortion,(Penal code),misrepresentation. Most of the money Mr. Baganizi stole belongs to the U.S. Naval Officer, to be repaid. Ms. Srivastav is being used to launder California Courts moneys overseas. Making this case a White - Collar Crimes, which often involves large amounts of moneys, like the amount owed to Petitioner in millions. These type of crimes are normally committed by a business professional, like Mr. Baganizi, and Ms. Srivastav, or by Civil and Public servants, like Court Clerks, Judges involved in Petitioner case, who made Mr. Baganizi win a case they have facts, and evidences that he has defrauded the State of California, San Bernardino County of a Legal Marriage, and has defrauded San Bernardino Court records of a Divorce decree, only Judgement, (inside jobs), defrauded Petitioner of \$millions and has stolen Arrears in support of his own son for 11 years. Ms. Sonia Lepe Santos is the one running Ms. Indu Srivastav telemarketing Law Firm in Fullerton California, without Ms. Srivastav ever being present daily in that office for supervision, to operates a valid law Business office professionally to be allowed to represent anyone in California, Her business office isn't registered with the State Bar of California, as in Limited liability Partnership or law Corporation, because no California authorities have fingerprinted, to check her criminal record'. All is proven by different handwriting on her 2000 Bar exam Application, with different signatures presented in this case.

From July 9, 2021, until now, Ms. Srivastav has never appeared before The State of California Courts, in person, as an attorney of record. The State of California, Riverside Appeal Court, is within 45 minutes from her presumed office. The State of California, San Bernardino County

Superior is within one hour drive, and her client, Respondent, has not appeared in person neither. Respondent living overseas, working for World Bank International has refused to give Ms. Srivastav a Power of Attorney, with Original, wet, signature, Certified, Exemplified, and Authenticated, for her representation to be valid, and be accepted in California Courts, according to *18 U.S Code 3492 Commission to Consular Officers to Authenticate Foreign Documents*. Both living overseas, has not filed in Court, Original with wets signature, notarized, certified, exemplified, authenticated signed Substitution of Attorney, Civil (form MC-050) to allow Ms. Srivastav, to be on this case. Her court declarations are Null and Void. Making Respondent case, a Miscarriage of Justice, he cannot win.

Ms. Srivastav, living overseas in India, has never set foot in California to pass the California Bar law License, she is using to defraud Californians Resident moneys for 23 years; Petitioner money included. which constituent a White-collar crime, committed usually by Business Professional like Respondent, and Ms. Srivastav, or public servant, Civil Servants like the State of California Honorable Justice Guerrero, Presiding Judge Ramirez, Honorable Judge Miller, Honorable Judge Fields, Honorable Judge Steven J, Singley, and Honorable Judge Joel Agron, who has removed from calendar his own ruling on January 18, 2024, in Remittitur, case of Indu Srivastav Sanctions, Vacate the Divorce decree, set aside divorce decree, for Petitioner to receive Annulment, making the case still pending. All to help Mr. Baganizi win a case he has committed numerous crimes, and Ms. Srivastav is used for stealing and laundering moneys overseas, a large number, of moneys, like what Mr. Baganizi owes Petitioner.

March 2008, Respondent was fired by United Nations for trying to pass to be married to a U.S Citizen, Petitioner, for Respondent to gain employment, steal their moneys, when Respondent

knew we were no longer together, embezzling United Nations moneys by theft, and stealing vacation money.

Also, on January 8, 2008, Respondent who was a U.S Resident stole U.S Petitioner document, signed Petitioner signature to her Unbeknown to adopt his nephew, to receive U.S social service moneys \$5,200.00 per month from 2009. Which is fraud and Grand theft.

Respondent with his previous Attorney, Will Mullins, now a State of California, San Bernardino County Judge, filed in the San Bernardino Court records, "Divorce Decree, only Judgement", Meaning without an Original wet Judge Signature to seal the Divorce decree, only judgement by fraud. Ms. Beatrice Uwamariya is still married to Mr. Enias Baganizi who has defrauded San Bernardino County of a Marriage, and of a Divorce decree, only judgement.

Respondent has committed obstruction of justice, keeping this case going for 21 years, without paying Petitioner what he owes her, and conspiracy to hurt Petitioner, who was injected of a contaminated vaccine, attempt to poison my food, all my 3 cars were hacked with the highest technology, Respondent and wife pays for, to the San Bernardino Organized criminal, hackers, fixers, who believes he will pay them all the moneys he owes Petitioner, making Petitioner life miserable, and Petitioner has been living in fear.

Honorable Chief Justice Guerrero, of the California Supreme Court, Case S283118, Honorable Presiding Judge Ramirez, Honorable Judge Miller, and Honorable Judge Fields, Riverside Court of Appeal, State of California Fourth Appellate, Second Division, by concealing the truth, and by accepting Respondent Marital fraud, deceit, dishonesty, manipulations, tricks, as the truth, like the Divorce he provided to marry Petitioner was from a Bailiff. A divorce from a Bailiff without an Official divorce with a Family Law Affairs Judge in Mali, is not recognized abroad. Bailiffs are Court security officers to the Judges, and do not award official Divorces. An Official divorce

signed by a family Law Affairs Judge from Mali, must be Original, Notarized, certified, exemplified, authenticated by U.S Embassy, Respondent was working for, according to 18 U.S Code 3492 Commission to Consular Officers to Authenticate Foreign Documents. The one stamp on the Bailiff divorce, Respondent provided does not make the divorce official, because it is a not from A Family Law Affairs Judge in Mali, to be used to receive valid legal Marriage overseas. And according to Canada Border, Respondent divorce was supposed to come only from the Country where his wife and children are resident, Citizen of, lived within the last 12 months of his divorce, of November 25, 2002, and of January 28, 2003, which was Canada, not Mali. Due to family violence to protect their children, Canada Embassy sent the wife, and the children back to Canada, in January 2001. And Respondent was with them in Canada, September 2001, which is the last place they all lived together, not Mali. (28 U.S. Code § 455).

The State of California Court Judges involved in this case, and Ms. Srivastav, allowing Respondent stealing all Petitioner assets, lost her 2 houses, and a yearly income of \$150,000.00-\$250,000.00 as a pharmacist, a profession Petitioner was training for, when Respondent came into her life, but can't no longer stand on her 2 feet, for long, for a 12 hours shift working, after being physically injured by Respondent, back and neck nerves injuries, living with fibromyalgia, and vertebral stenosis, due to Respondent battery. Petitioner 3 cars, worth more than \$45,000.00 each, 2 paid off were hacked, and destroyed by Respondent hackers and fixers; Mr. Dodie Rass, a San Bernardino County, Sheriff, and District Attorney's informant, without any credentials, helping them to steal Innocent victims Court cases with money on, followed Petitioner to the car dealers, where Petitioner was getting her car fixed, to steal her flash drives, and Court document, to call Ms. Caroline Musabe, and start a case without Mr. Baganizi signature, using a fraud Attorney from India, made false reports, write fake cases, while

Petitioner was refused an advance for an Attorney from Respondent who has stolen all my savings, and assets.

The State of California Court knowing Petitioner, and family have been San Bernardino County resident for over 30 years, have never done anything wrong, should have been protected from Mr. Enias Baganizi, (Respondent), and his hackers, fixers, who has been writing cases, even now, helping Paralegal Sonia Pele Santos, who has been signing Court deposition, without being an Attorney. The U.S Government is in marriage to protect their Residents/Citizens of Marriage fraud. Mr. Baganizi kept Petitioner under his custody until after receiving U.S. Resident, which is considered as kidnaping by fraud, *Penal code 207*, is defined as moving another person, a substantial distance, far from her home, without knowledge of not being legally married, which is by means of force, by deceit and false claims, and is considered as servitude, and hate crimes. Petitioner whole family has been victimized by Respondent, fraud, crimes of violence, battery, injured Petitioner back and neck nerves due to Physical abuses, to live with Fibromyalgia, and vertebral stenosis, unable to provide for her family, in need for spousal Support from Respondent, an income to live on, Petitioner requested \$10,000.00 per month which is reasonable, Respondent making over \$40,000.00 per month. Petitioner has been hurt emotionally, verbally, financially. Petitioner, and our son, 20 years old, a full-time student been forced to live under poverty level, sometimes eating one meal per day, with no reliable transportation, an urgent need to buy a home to live in, to have a roof over our head. In need to repay back everyone who have been helping to keep us afloat.

Petitioner contacted FBI, who agree that an Attorney, and forensic expert are needed, since the Court records has affirmed, on January 8, 2024, that they do not have in their possession a Wet

original signature of Honorable Judge Tara Reilly of July 30th, 2010, in San Bernardino County, Court records, with a child, to seal our divorce.

On January 18, 2024, Petitioner has requested San Bernardino County Superior Court to set aside the divorce, and vacate the Divorce, because Bigamy is an allegation that support a request for annulment, which void a marriage, as it never occurred; knowing Bigamy is unconstitutional, under U.S Law. As of today, the Respondent is a still married man to two women. Petitioner is in need of a fair Family Court Judge with Integrity, who understands, and has done prior cases with World Bank Employees earnings, not paying taxes, in Washington D.C. If possible, to kindly please Change this case venue. (*U.S. Const. Amend. XIV §1, Due Process, Equal Protection, 18 U.S. Code § 241-Conspiracy against rights.18 U.S. Code § 242-Deprivation of rights under color of law*).

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Petitioner, now petitions this Court for a Writ of Certiorari and presents the questions set forth and, for the U.S Supreme Court consideration of the merits, to grant the Petition, for Petitioner as a Putative wife to receive half of Mr. Baganizi salaries, benefits retirement from January 2008, with spousal support for life due to being injured, and to receive from San Bernardino County, Restitution, Compensation and Costs, for pain and sufferings, by San Bernardino County who by negligence has legally married Petitioner to a very bad man, violent, fraudulent, a skilled manipulative man, with A PHD title, using Moneys stolen from Petitioner, C.D.C, U. S Government Institution, United Nations, and World Bank International, to pay, and corrupt anyone who will accept bribes to acquit him in all his numerous crimes, he has committed, Intentionally with Premeditation, and Malice. Money owed to Petitioner will be determined by

Litigation attorneys. This is a White-Collar Crimes case, where the California State Bar issued Ms. Indu Srivastav, a valid license knowing she isn't a qualified Attorney, not present in California soil, with no law training, from India, without legally fingerprinting her, to have harmed California residents losing their cases for 23 years, where fixers, hackers, fake, Attorney embezzling funds, laundering moneys overseas to divide it later. Ms. Sonia Lepe Santos has practiced unlawful Law, and Ms. Therese L.Shortridge

The State of California, San Bernardino County, Administration Judicial Officer Lisa Rogan, failed to fix this case of injustice. Instead, she has been covering up for Honorable Judge Steven J. Singley, and Honorable Judge Joel Agron, misconducts, acquitting Mr. Baganizi who has defrauded Petitioner using their Court system, after defrauding them of a legal Marriage, and of a Divorce decree, only Judgement. Presiding Judicial Officer Guerrero, of the California Supreme Court, President Honorable Judge Ramirez, Honorable Judge Miller, Honorable Judge Fields, of The State of California Riverside Appeal, Fourth Appellate, second division, knew Ms. Srivastav uses Video calls, IP Address, and Court Coordinates from India, knew her Business Law office is not registered in California, not with California State Bar, not with the Secretary of State, not with the City of Fullerton, because she is nowhere, to be Found in California to be fingerprinted, in order for her to operate any valid law Business, to represent anyone legally in California, but made her win illegally, stating her Law License is valid, but failed asking her to recuse herself, until she is fingerprinted by California Authorities, to know who she is really, to check if her criminal record is clean to practice law in California, because having a Valid California Bar License is not enough. "Nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws".

Mr. Baganizi, Ms. Caroline Musabe, both Canadian Citizen, using 3 nationalities to fool most, knowing they were never legally divorced, but through fraud, false claims, defrauding Petitioner of her life, her health, her wealth, were able to obtain Green Card/ Citizenship to receive prestigious jobs in America.

Mr. Baganizi has committed fraud, perjury, felony when signing under oath his 2 weeks salaries as his monthly salaries, refusing to disclose his income, salaries, benefits for 11 years, to steal from Petitioner. Arrears, moneys owed to Custodians parents, age of the child, and being emancipated does not matter. And in case Mr. Baganizi fails to comply with a subpoena, and court request addressed to him personally, Petitioner request is for the Court to hold him in contempt, and invoke serious penalties and sanctions, including jail. The threat of punitive judicial sanctions can act as a powerful incentive for Respondent to comply, knowing he is the Oppressor, the fraud.

This has been a very long journey, 21 years, where Mr. Baganizi forced himself into our lives like he is an honest decent man, to find out he is not Mr. Baganizi has committed fraud Marriage, Bigamy, kidnapping, servitude, enslaver, and committed perjury, lying under oath claiming he is divorced legally when, he was not.

Judge's legal Error, Fraud on The Court, white collar crime has happened, Violations of Petitioner Civil Right, my Human Rights, and I have been discriminated against, to Make Respondent, A Mastermind Win a Case He Did Not Appear in Person on October 4th, 2022, when Honorable Judge Steven Singley, Temporary Judge Fuertsch, Does Not Possess Any Substitution of Attorney in San Bernardino Family Court Records, And Does Not Possess Any Power of Attorney, allowing Mr. Baganizi working overseas, to be legally represented by a California Attorney, not an overseas telemarketing, no one has seen, not fingerprinted by

California authorities. Where proof of tampering with evidence, her handwriting and signature is obvious.

Mr. Baganizi Has Refused to Sign to Be Represented, there is No One Signature of Respondent in the entire case. San Bernardino Organized criminals' fixers, hackers, started a case of fraud, to steal my Moneys. NO WET SIGNATURES of Respondent in the whole entire case, which Is the Proof that set me free to win this entire case, to receive all Petitioner have lost for 21 years, which will be determined by A Litigation Attorney. Ms. Uwamariya_is to receive half of Mr. Baganizi salaries and benefits, Retirement, from January, 2008, to Today's Date, Compensation, Restitution for Pain and Suffering from The San Bernardino County, Family Court, who Has Married Petitioner to A Violent Man, A Thief, A Kidnapper by fraud, Grand theft, our son support fraud, perjury, but Has continued to fail to acknowledge their mistakes, error, and correcting their Wrongdoing, instead of making Mr. Baganizi win cases he has committed bigamy, fraud marriage, perjury, misrepresentation, oppression, extortion, kidnapping by fraud, hate crimes, taking me and my 2 sons, minors, far away, and forcing me to sell my house in Loma Linda, and in Smyrna, Georgia, in order to use the proceeds for a down payment on house he put his name on, using my credit history and my down payment, to gain credit, and to buy himself houses, cars knowing he is a still married man in Canada. Respondent has received everything in life by stealing from others, embezzled U.N

The State of California, Riverside Appeal Court Has been getting away by making most cases with moneys Unpublished. In our case, neither Respondent nor Petitioner have asked to make our case unpublished, but they did it to hide they have Addressed a Minute Court Order on April 27/2023 without Judge Singley signing the Final Court Order. Judge Singley, has also failed to address Petitioner request on moneys, as a Putative wife to receive half of Mr. Baganizi

income and benefits, savings, Retirement, properties. On November 30, 2021, Petitioner should have won half of Mr. Baganizi's assets, since there is No Judge Signature on Divorce Decree, only Judgement of July 30th, 2010. And on April 4th, 2022, Judge Singley failed to address Restitution, Compensation from San Bernardino County, and Half of Mr.Baganizi assets, as a Putative wife, Innocent spouse. Petitioner should have won the Child Support Arrears due to Fraud, and due to No show, no Court in Court hearing. Mr. Baganizi refusing to disclose his salaries from his place of employment, for 11 years, giving his 2 week paychecks, as his monthly salaries, on Income and expenses, signing under oath, which constitute fraud, 11 years Arrears are due to Petitioner, as Judge Diana Renteria ruled on September 9, 2021, and the age of our child, being over 18 years old, emancipated, does not matter, when dealing with arrears, moneys owed to Custodial parent; Petitioner. And on April 4,2022, there was no Court Appearance of Mr. Baganizi, and Ms. Srivastav, for Honorable Temporary Judge Charles M. Fuertsch, to call for *Cal. Code Civ. Proc. 473 (d)*. A Judgment void on its face, due to no Court Appearance of Respondent, is subject to be Set aside at any time, to make Petitioner win this case of injustices.

Respondent is determined to show, to the whole world, he can outsmart anyone, he can come from Canada, when he did not divorce his wife; his accomplice, Ms. Caroline Musabe, position her to work in Human resources at World Bank, to remove request from San Bernardino Child Support Services, from Attorneys, and from Petitioner, according to Mr. Jeff Silverstein, World Bank Officer Ethics, Petitioner wrote to, and who told her, over the phone describing someone resembling Ms. Caroline Musabe, from Human resource', came and collected the letter I wrote to him, saying Human Resource will address it, but was never addressed. Respondent and Ms. Musabe have been using the money stolen from Petitioner, from U.S International Institutions, after stealing a Green Card/ Citizenship, as there is no Justice in California. Even

after receiving everything by fraud, Respondent have refused to do the right thing, to take care of our son, his own, by paying the right amount in support, repay back everything he has stolen from Petitioner who is a Putative spouse, injured by him, because he is a violent man, he lacks empathy, kindness, every American, every father should possess toward his own son. Respondents rather pay fixers, and hackers to help him evade, U.S laws.

“Any Judge, or magistrate Judge of the United States is required by Law to recuse himself from any case, in which their objectivity might be legitimately questioned. According to both Federal and State Law, Judges must withdraw from a case if there are good reasons to do so”. (*28 U.S. Code § 455*).

“No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privilege or immunities of Citizen of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction, the equal protection of the laws”. (*U.S. Const. Amend.XIV§1*)

“In suits at common Law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of a trial by Jury, shall be preserved”.


CONCLUSION

Honorable Justices,

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Executed in Loma Linda CA, on May 7, 2024.



Beatrice M. Uwamariya