

No. 24-1245

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

DEC 13 2024

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

In the
Supreme Court of the United States

Masika Brown Ray,
Petitioner,

— v. —

Sheriff, Maxey Cerliano, Gregg County, TX;
Chief, Anthony Boone, City of Longview, TX;
Officer, Leslie Sheridan; Officer, Kyle Tucker;
Sergeant, Luke Altman; Julia Rhyner, CPS
caseworker; Jennifer Stout, CPS caseworker;
Mallory Waugh-Brown, CPS Texas Department of
Family and Protective Services State of Texas,
Respondents.

**PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE
FIFTH CIRCUIT**

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Masika Brown Ray
312 Meadowlark Ln.
Longview, TX 75603
Phone: (903) 736-1238
Email: MasikaRay@gmail.com

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. **Constitutional Violations of Due Process and Equal Protection:** Did the Fifth Circuit err in affirming the district court's dismissal, where substantial constitutional violations under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments were alleged, including wrongful detention based on falsified evidence, denial of a fair hearing, and discriminatory treatment through selective enforcement and disparate treatment?
2. **Eighth and Fourth Amendment Claims:** Does the continued denial of bail, absent substantial evidence and without consideration of the petitioner's minimal flight risk, constitute excessive bail contrary to the Eighth Amendment? Furthermore, considering the documented Ring video evidence of police brutality and use of excessive force, do these actions violate the Fourth Amendment, thereby necessitating this Court's intervention to clarify and enforce standards of police accountability, and to ensure fair treatment of citizens subjected to government misconduct?

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING AND CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Petitioner is Masika Brown Ray. The Petitioner is an individual and does not require a corporate disclosure statement.

Respondents include Sheriff Maxey Cerliano, Gregg County, TX; Chief Anthony Boone, City of Longview, TX; Officers Leslie Sheridan and Kyle Tucker; Sergeant Luke Altman; Julia Rhyner, CPS Caseworker; Jennifer Stout, CPS Caseworker; Mallory Waugh-Brown, CPS Supervisor; Texas Department of Family and Protective Services; and the State of Texas. These respondents are various government officials and entities involved in the enforcement of law and administration of state social services. None of these respondents are publicly traded companies, nor do they have a parent company or any publicly held corporation that owns 10% or more of their stock.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS

1. Initial Trial Proceedings:

Court: U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas

Case Number: 4:23-cv-00124

Outcome: Dismissal of all claims against respondents; order issued on March 12, 2024.

2. Appellate Proceedings:

Court: United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

Case Number: 24-50788

Outcome: Affirmation of the district court's dismissal; opinion issued on July 19, 2024.

3. Motion for Rehearing En Banc:

Court: United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

Case Number: 24-50788

Outcome: Denial of the motion for rehearing en banc; order issued on September 15, 2024.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. QUESTIONS PRESENTED.....	i
II. PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING.....	ii
III. RELATED PROCEEDINGS.....	iii
IV. TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
V. TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	vi
VI. OPINIONS BELOW.....	2
VII. STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION.....	2
VIII. STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3
IX. APPLICATION OF LEGAL STANDARDS.....	4
X. STATEMENT OF THE CASE	10
XI. INTRODUCTION.....	11
XII. FACTUAL BACKGROUND	12
XIII. REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION	15
XIV. REQUEST FOR MONETARY COMPENSATION AND ATTORNEY FEES.....	18
Guidelines for Evaluating the Award	18
Review of Jury's Decision	19

XV. CONCLUSION AND PRAYER FOR RELIEF.....	20
Appendix A: United States Court of Appeals, Opinion, filed October 2, 2024	2a
Appendix B: United States District Court, Eastern District of Texas, Marshall Division, Final Judgment, filed March 1, 2024	7a
Appendix C: United States District Court, Eastern District of Texas, Marshall Division, Order of Dismissal, filed March 1, 2024	8a

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**CASES**

<i>Goldberg v. Kelly</i> , 397 U.S. 254 (1970)	4-5
<i>In re Gault</i> , 387 U.S. 1 (1967)	5-6
<i>Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co.</i> , 339 U.S. 306 (1950)	4-5
<i>Stack v. Boyle</i> , 342 U.S. 1 (1951)	7
<i>Tennessee v. Garner</i> , 471 U.S. 1 (1985)	8-9

STATUTES

42 U.S.C. § 1983	4
------------------------	---

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

U.S. Constitution, Amend. IV.....	4, 8-9, 16
U.S. Constitution, Amend. V	3, 4, 9, 10, 20
U.S. Constitution, Amend. VIII.2-3, 7, 9-10, 15, 16, 20	
U.S. Constitution, Amend. XIV	3-4, 8, 10, 16, 20

OTHER AUTHORITIES

New King James Bible, Deuteronomy	22
New King James Bible, Exodus.....	22
New King James Bible, Luke	22
New King James Bible, Zechariah	22

No. _____

In the
Supreme Court of the United States

Masika Brown Ray,
Petitioner.

— v. —

Sheriff, Maxey Cerliano, Gregg County, TX;
Chief, Anthony Boone, City of Longview, TX;
Officer, Leslie Sheridan; Officer, Kyle Tucker;
Sergeant, Luke Altman; Julia Rhyner, CPS
caseworker; Jennifer Stout, CPS caseworker;
Mallory Waugh-Brown, CPS Texas Department of
Family and Protective Services State of Texas,
Respondents.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE
FIFTH CIRCUIT

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Masika Brown Ray respectfully petitions for a writ of certiorari to review the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. This case presents pivotal questions about the scope and application of due process, equal protection, police

and government misconduct accountability, and the constitutional limits on arbitrary detention practices by state authorities. The denial of Ms. Ray's fundamental rights by Texas state actors, endorsed by the Fifth Circuit's affirmation of the lower court's dismissal, underscores a critical need for judicial review to ensure stringent enforcement of constitutional safeguards.

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit, which denied the petitioner's appeal, has been published. A copy of this opinion is appended hereto as Appendix 1. The order of the district court that denied the petitioner's motion is not reported. A copy of this order is appended hereto as Appendix 2.

STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION

The jurisdiction of this Honorable Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1), which authorizes the Supreme Court to review on writ of certiorari final judgments or decrees rendered by the United States Courts of Appeals. The decision in question was issued by the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, representing the final adjudication from which relief can be sought. This Court's review is warranted to resolve substantial questions of constitutional law presented by the petitioner that have significant implications for the protection of civil liberties under the Fifth, Eighth, and Fourteenth Amendments of the United States Constitution.

STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

The issues presented in this petition implicate fundamental rights protected under the United States Constitution and specific statutes that provide for civil remedies against violations of these rights. The relevant provisions include:

1. **Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution:** Guarantees that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, ensuring fair legal procedures and protections against arbitrary governmental actions.
2. **Eighth Amendment to the United States Constitution:** Prohibits the federal government from imposing excessive bail, excessive fines, or inflicting cruel and unusual punishments, thereby securing individuals against undue and punitive pre-trial detention.
3. **Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution:** Ensures that no state shall 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. This amendment extends due process and equal protection guarantees to actions by state and local governments.
4. **Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution:** Protects individuals from unreasonable searches and seizures and sets standards for police conduct during arrests and other encounters with the public.

5. **42 U.S.C. § 1983 (Civil Rights Act):** Provides a remedy to parties who are deprived of constitutional rights by an individual acting under the color of state law. This statute is crucial for civil rights litigation, allowing for federal legal recourse in cases of constitutional violations by state actors.

These provisions are directly implicated in the allegations of wrongful detention, excessive bail, discriminatory enforcement, and police misconduct. The interpretations of these statutes and constitutional amendments are critical to resolving the questions presented in this petition.

APPLICATION OF LEGAL STANDARDS

1. Due Process (Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments)

The Due Process Clause requires that the government adhere to procedural fairness by providing individuals with adequate notice, a fair hearing, and an impartial decision-maker before depriving them of life, liberty, or property. In *Goldberg v. Kelly*, 397 U.S. 254 (1970), the Court held that due process protections apply to administrative actions that impact individuals' essential rights, while *Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co.*, 339 U.S. 306 (1950), established the necessity of reasonable notice in proceedings affecting personal rights.

In Ms. Ray's case, her detention was based on an affidavit containing false allegations, violating her right to fair treatment under the law. No legitimate opportunity was provided for her to challenge the validity of these allegations or present her defense,

thereby bypassing fundamental due process protections. Additionally, the state's unlawful retention of Ms. Ray's property without providing any legal justification infringed upon her property rights without due process, impeding her ability to communicate with legal counsel and participate effectively in her defense. This complete disregard for procedural safeguards in Ms. Ray's detention represents a significant deviation from the requirements established by *Goldberg* and *Mullane*, as the state's actions deprived her of both liberty and property without the constitutionally mandated procedural protections.

In a disturbing breach of both ethical standards and procedural safeguards, a detective involved in this case questioned Ms. Ray's 10-year-old daughter in an attempt to obtain the password to Ms. Ray's personal phone. The detective later admitted this action to Ms. Ray. Such conduct is not only highly invasive and unprofessional, but it also raises significant legal concerns regarding the use of minors as sources of potentially self-incriminating information against their parents.

The United States Supreme Court has established in *In re Gault*, 387 U.S. 1 (1967), that minors are entitled to constitutional protections in interactions with law enforcement. In *Gault*, the Court emphasized the importance of protecting young individuals during police questioning, noting that minors may not fully understand the implications of law enforcement inquiries or the rights they hold. Although *Gault* primarily addressed due process in juvenile delinquency proceedings, its principles extend to situations where law enforcement seeks

information from a child, particularly in cases where the child may unknowingly aid in a search without proper authorization or understanding.

Moreover, statements by police officers discussing Ms. Ray's security cameras—and their awareness that the initial acts of police brutality were recorded—raise serious concerns about potential retaliatory motives for Ms. Ray's prolonged detention without bail. Ms. Ray's brother and Realtor tried to bail her out on two separate occasions. Both times, Ms. Ray's bail was denied until a nurse at the jail helped her get out the third time when inmates were trying to attack her. The detective's decision to question Ms. Ray's young daughter for her phone password, along with officers' discussions regarding the camera footage, strongly suggests that law enforcement was motivated to hold Ms. Ray to prevent further scrutiny over the documented brutality.

The extended detention Ms. Ray faced without bail, combined with pressure placed on her daughter to provide access to her personal phone, illustrates a troubling pattern of intimidation and disregard for the rights of both Ms. Ray and her family. This misuse of authority appears intended not only to impede Ms. Ray's ability to defend herself but also to intimidate those close to her, thereby violating constitutional protections and ethical policing standards.

2. Excessive Bail (Eighth Amendment)

The Eighth Amendment's prohibition against excessive bail is intended to prevent punitive detention of individuals who have not been convicted of a crime. In *Stack v. Boyle*, 342 U.S. 1 (1951), the

Court established that bail must reflect the seriousness of the offense, the defendant's likelihood of appearing at trial, and must not serve as punishment. *United States v. Salerno*, 481 U.S. 739 (1987), reaffirmed that preventive detention is permissible only when justified by substantial evidence related to flight risk or potential danger to the community.

Despite her low flight risk and lack of any substantive evidence linking her to serious criminal conduct, Ms. Ray was repeatedly denied bail, resulting in prolonged detention. This denial of bail functioned as a punitive measure rather than a necessary step to ensure her presence at trial, effectively punishing Ms. Ray without a conviction. Such treatment contravenes the principles set forth in *Stack v. Boyle*, as it used bail denial not as a tool for legitimate judicial purposes, but as a punitive means that prolonged her detainment. The lack of evidence justifying this denial also undermines the Salerno standard, emphasizing the state's failure to apply appropriate bail standards and avoid excessive detainment.

3. Equal Protection (Fourteenth Amendment)

The Equal Protection Clause mandates that state laws be applied fairly and without discrimination. In *Yick Wo v. Hopkins*, 118 U.S. 356 (1886), the Court ruled that even facially neutral laws violate the Fourteenth Amendment when applied in a discriminatory manner. This principle affirms that states may not selectively enforce laws or apply punitive measures in a manner that disadvantages

certain individuals based on arbitrary or discriminatory factors.

Ms. Ray's case exhibits a pattern of discriminatory application of punitive measures without just cause, suggesting that she was targeted in a way that violates equal protection principles. The denial of bail, retention of property, and use of falsified evidence against Ms. Ray demonstrate a selective and arbitrary misuse of state authority. Such actions reflect discriminatory enforcement practices that contravene *Yick Wo*, where the Court emphasized the need for fairness and consistency in the application of laws. The selective treatment Ms. Ray endured underscores an unequal application of punitive measures that infringes upon her right to equal protection under the Fourteenth Amendment.

4. Police Accountability (Fourth Amendment)

The Fourth Amendment's protections against unreasonable searches and seizures extend to safeguarding individuals from excessive force and abuse by law enforcement. In *Tennessee v. Garner*, 471 U.S. 1 (1985), the Court established that law enforcement may use force only when it is justified by the presence of an immediate and significant threat. This precedent sets limits on police conduct to prevent arbitrary use of power and ensure accountability.

The documented incidents of police intimidation and excessive force against Ms. Ray violate the Fourth Amendment's protections. Video evidence from Ms. Ray's personal Ring camera captures law enforcement officials using intimidation tactics and excessive force, behavior that clearly deviates from

the standards set forth in *Tennessee v. Garner*. The force applied in Ms. Ray's case was unjustified, as there was no indication that she posed a significant threat or resisted in a way that would necessitate such measures. The absence of any immediate danger to law enforcement underscores the arbitrary and abusive nature of the force used, warranting judicial intervention to reaffirm the Fourth Amendment's role in preventing unwarranted police misconduct.

The application of these legal standards to Ms. Ray's case reveals multiple constitutional violations by Texas state authorities, who failed to uphold procedural due process, applied excessive and punitive bail practices, engaged in discriminatory enforcement actions, and demonstrated a disregard for police accountability. Each of these violations aligns with established legal precedents, yet the state's actions in Ms. Ray's case reflect a complete disregard for these standards. Supreme Court review is therefore necessary to address these constitutional breaches and to reaffirm the protections provided under the Fifth, Eighth, and Fourteenth Amendments, ensuring that similar injustices are prevented in the future.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This petition arises from egregious constitutional violations experienced by Petitioner, Masika Brown Ray, involving misconduct by local law enforcement and state social services in Gregg County, Texas. Ms. Ray contends that her rights under the Fifth, Eighth, and Fourteenth Amendments were grossly violated through wrongful detention, denial of bail, police

brutality, and discriminatory practices by government entities, all occurring without the necessary procedural safeguards or just cause.

The origins of this case trace back to a false affidavit submitted by a Child Protective Services (CPS) caseworker. This affidavit, lacking substantiated claims, led to Ms. Ray's unjust detention without a fair opportunity to contest the allegations or defend her rights in a court of law. This initial detention, unsupported by substantial evidence or just cause, escalated into repeated denials of bail and culminated in physical and verbal abuses substantiated by video evidence. Such treatment not only violated Ms. Ray's right to due process and protection against excessive bail but also exposed systemic issues of discrimination and misuse of power within local government operations.

Throughout this ordeal, Ms. Ray was subjected to dehumanizing treatment by law enforcement officers, including police brutality and the use of excessive force, documented on Ms. Ray's personal Ring camera. Moreover, Texas law enforcement officials unlawfully seized Ms. Ray's personal property, depriving her of essential resources to communicate with legal counsel and coordinate her defense.

When Ms. Ray sought judicial recourse, the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas dismissed her claims, and the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals subsequently affirmed this dismissal without adequately addressing the significant constitutional violations involved. The appellate court's decision effectively endorsed the lower court's disregard for procedural and substantive constitutional claims raised.

Given the finality of the appellate court's decision and the profound constitutional questions involved, Ms. Ray seeks a writ of certiorari from this Court to rectify the miscarriage of justice and clarify the protections afforded to individuals against state abuses under the Constitution. This petition represents Ms. Ray's final recourse to obtain justice and correct the failures of lower courts to address the abuses inflicted upon her, upholding constitutional protections against government overreach, arbitrary detention, and discriminatory enforcement practices.

INTRODUCTION

This petition for a writ of certiorari arises from grave violations of constitutional rights experienced by Masika Brown Ray, who has suffered from the misconduct of local law enforcement and state social services in Gregg County, Texas. This case, deeply entrenched in issues of wrongful detention, denial of bail, police brutality, and discriminatory treatment, calls into question the application of due process, equal protection, and the proper scope of police accountability under the United States Constitution. The actions taken against Ms. Ray, endorsed by the affirmations of both the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas and the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, epitomize a miscarriage of justice that demands this Court's intervention.

This petition seeks to address fundamental constitutional questions: whether state actors can impinge on an individual's rights under the guise of legal authority without facing judicial repercussion,

and whether the courts below failed to apply crucial constitutional protections. By granting this writ, the Supreme Court will not only provide necessary relief to Ms. Ray but also set a precedent that strengthens the enforcement of constitutional safeguards essential for the liberty of every American.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

This case presents a troubling series of egregious violations of Masika Brown Ray's constitutional rights by various Texas state authorities, including local law enforcement officers and representatives from Child Protective Services (CPS). The incidents at issue began with the submission of an unsubstantiated and false affidavit by CPS caseworkers. This affidavit, devoid of evidentiary support, falsely accused Ms. Ray of being unfit to care for her children, setting in motion a chain of constitutional violations that deprived her of her liberty, property, and the right to fair treatment under the law.

A. Initiation of State Intervention

Ms. Ray, a resident of Texas and a dedicated mother, became the target of state intervention based on an affidavit filed by CPS caseworkers. This document was pivotal to the state's case against her and included allegations that were both false and misleading, casting Ms. Ray in an unfounded negative light. Subsequently, CPS and local law enforcement collaborated to remove her children from her custody and detain her. Despite Ms. Ray's repeated

assertions of innocence and requests to contest the allegations, she was provided no legitimate evidence to justify these actions, nor was she given a meaningful opportunity to challenge the claims, thus violating the fundamental principles of due process.

B. Unjust Detention and Denial of Bail

Following her initial detention, Ms. Ray faced repeated and unjust denials of bail, leading to prolonged detainment without conviction or substantial grounds. Despite posing minimal flight risk and having no criminal history, the courts continually refused bail, citing the seriousness of the unsubstantiated allegations without considering the absence of credible evidence. This punitive measure not only deprived Ms. Ray of her liberty but also exposed her to considerable hardship, as she was forced to remain in custody unjustifiably, exacerbating her sense of injustice and feeling of being punished without trial.

C. Police Misconduct and Seizure of Property

While detained, Ms. Ray endured further abuses by law enforcement officers who engaged in acts of intimidation and excessive force. Footage from her personal Ring camera, obtained before her detainment, captured law enforcement officers employing aggressive tactics, including verbal intimidation and physical force. These actions were unwarranted, as Ms. Ray was neither violent nor resisting arrest, suggesting a deliberate effort to subdue her through excessive police

power. Additionally, Texas state authorities confiscated her communication devices, including her cell phone and personal documents, without any legal justification. The deprivation of these essential items severely impacted her ability to coordinate her defense, communicate with her family, and prepare for legal proceedings. The arbitrary retention of Ms. Ray's property underlines the procedural abuses in this case, as it further isolated her from necessary support and hindered her ability to mount an effective defense.

D. Systemic Violations and Lack of Judicial Recourse

Throughout her ordeal, Ms. Ray was denied the basic procedural safeguards constitutionally required to prevent arbitrary and discriminatory actions by state actors. Despite the absence of credible evidence, she remained detained without a fair opportunity to challenge the allegations, and state officials utilized fabricated claims to justify continued interference in her life and parental rights. The treatment she received reflects a punitive approach rather than a fair and balanced administration of justice, demonstrating a failure to uphold protections guaranteed by the Fifth and Eighth Amendments against undue deprivation of liberty and excessive bail.

Ultimately, this case underscores a series of coordinated actions by Texas state entities that not only deprived Ms. Ray of her constitutional rights but also subjected her to punitive and discriminatory treatment without due process. The Fifth Circuit

Court of Appeals affirmed the district court's decision to dismiss her claims without fully addressing these significant abuses, leaving Ms. Ray without recourse and underscoring the need for Supreme Court intervention. The circumstances of her case highlight the urgent necessity to reassert constitutional protections against arbitrary state power, excessive bail, and unequal application of the law, necessitating a review by this Honorable Court.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted for several compelling reasons that underscore the importance of this case in the broader context of constitutional law and civil rights.

- 1. Clarification of Constitutional Protections Against Arbitrary Detention and Excessive Bail:** This case presents a critical opportunity for the Court to reinforce the constitutional limits on detention practices and bail determinations, which are fundamental to the concept of fair treatment under the law. The persistent denial of bail to Ms. Ray, despite no substantial evidence to justify such measures, calls for a reevaluation of the Eighth Amendment's safeguard against excessive bail. The Court's intervention is essential to prevent the misuse of pre-trial detention as a punitive tool, which poses a significant threat to liberty.
- 2. Enforcement of Due Process and Equal Protection:** The actions taken by Texas authorities in Ms. Ray's case raise serious due process concerns, including wrongful detention

based on unsubstantiated claims and a lack of a fair hearing. This case also highlights issues of discriminatory treatment by state actors, making it imperative for the Court to clarify the obligations of state actors under the Fourteenth Amendment to ensure that all persons receive equal protection of the laws.

3. **Addressing Police Misconduct and Fourth Amendment Violations:** The documented evidence of police brutality and the misuse of force in Ms. Ray's case require the Court to address the standards of police accountability. This review is crucial to affirm the Fourth Amendment's protections against unreasonable searches and seizures, particularly regarding the use of force by law enforcement. Clarifying these standards would serve not only to remedy Ms. Ray's situation but also to guide law enforcement practices nationwide.
4. **Impact on Public Trust and Judicial Integrity:** By granting this writ, the Court can reaffirm its role as a vital guardian of constitutional rights and civil liberties. This case presents an opportunity to restore public confidence in the judiciary's capacity to oversee and rectify abuses of power by state authorities. Ensuring that government entities are held accountable for constitutional violations is essential for maintaining the rule of law.
5. **Prevent Future Abuses:** Granting this petition will send a clear message to state actors across the country about the limits of their authority and the serious consequences of violating constitutional rights. It will also provide

guidance to lower courts on the rigorous enforcement of these standards, helping to prevent similar abuses in the future.

In sum, this petition warrants review because it encapsulates issues of fundamental rights and the proper limits of governmental authority that are of great public importance. The implications of this case extend far beyond the immediate parties involved, touching upon the basic principles of justice and legal fairness that the Supreme Court has consistently upheld.

REQUEST FOR MONETARY COMPENSATION AND ATTORNEY FEES

Ms. Masika Brown Ray respectfully requests monetary compensation of \$20 million or what the court sees fit to address the severe physical, emotional, and psychological distress she suffered due to the actions of Texas state authorities in this matter. In light of the extensive harm endured, this compensation is warranted not only as a form of redress but also as a deterrent against future abuses of power by law enforcement and other state actors. Additionally, Ms. Ray requests compensation for fees incurred in seeking justice and accountability for the substantial violations of her constitutional rights.

Guidelines for Evaluating the Award

To assist the Court in evaluating this compensation request, Ms. Ray provides the following guidelines, which are designed to ensure that the award is fair, reasonable, and reflective of the harm suffered:

- 1. Severity of Physical and Emotional Distress:** The Court should consider the significant physical and emotional toll inflicted upon Ms. Ray, including the prolonged detention of ten days, denial of bail twice, false documents of the police and CPS, and the documented incidents of police intimidation and brutality. The intensity and duration of these distressing experiences justify a substantial award.
- 2. Impact on Family and Relationships:** The Court should also take into account the impact on Ms. Ray's family, especially her minor

daughter, who was subjected to questioning by law enforcement under intimidating circumstances, and her oldest autistic daughter being away from her mother, uprooted from her daily routines of stability. The emotional trauma suffered by Ms. Ray's family further demonstrates the breadth of harm caused by the defendants' actions.

3. **Deterrent Effect:** The requested compensation should reflect the importance of deterring similar conduct by law enforcement and state officials. A substantial monetary award can serve as a reminder to government actors of the serious consequences of overstepping constitutional boundaries.
4. **Fees and Costs:** The Court should consider awarding fees to allow Ms. Ray to recover the financial burdens she has incurred while pursuing justice and holding accountable the parties responsible for violating her rights.

Review of Jury's Decision

In the interest of fairness, Ms. Ray requests that the Court allow for review of the jury's decision regarding this monetary award, ensuring that the awarded amount aligns with the substantial harms she has endured. This review will help to confirm that the award is consistent with precedents for similar constitutional violations and reflects a balanced consideration of the facts presented in this case.

By granting this request, the Court would provide Ms. Ray with much-needed financial relief, address the

profound harm inflicted upon her, and set a meaningful precedent underscoring the importance of constitutional protections for all citizens.

Ms. Ray respectfully urges this Court to grant certiorari to provide the necessary oversight in this matter. This would thereby reinforce the rule of law and ensure that the rights of all individuals are protected from arbitrary government actions.

CONCLUSION AND PRAYER FOR RELIEF

For the reasons set forth above, **Masika Brown Ray** respectfully requests that this Honorable Court grant the writ of certiorari to review the judgment of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. This case presents critical questions involving the application of constitutional protections against arbitrary detention, denial of due process, excessive bail, discriminatory treatment, and police misconduct. The Fifth Circuit's decision to affirm the district court's dismissal has left these grave constitutional violations unaddressed, thereby allowing the unchecked actions of Texas law enforcement and social services to continue infringing upon Ms. Ray's fundamental rights.

Ms. Ray's experience demonstrates a systemic failure by state actors to uphold the safeguards guaranteed under the Fifth, Eighth, and Fourteenth Amendments. Her detention, based on false allegations, repeated denial of bail, and the use of police intimidation tactics, not only constitutes severe violations of her rights but also underscores the need for judicial intervention to clarify and enforce these protections. By granting this petition, this Court

would reaffirm the constitutional principles prohibiting government misconduct, ensuring fair treatment under the law, and uphold the foundational protections guaranteed to all individuals.

Due to this incident, Ms. Ray missed her first and only Mother's Day away from her children. She and her family believe the Supreme Court can make her family whole straightway. With My Children Are Not Your Toys, LLC. and @MasikaAkilah on YouTube, created by Ms. Ray, she is dedicated to helping innocent families like hers who are victims of CPS and other corruption. Yet, Ms. Ray's family sincerely needs help and justice, too. We pray that Ms. Ray and her family find true justice with The Supreme Court of the United States of America, in Jesus' name. Amen.

Wherefore, **Masika Brown Ray** respectfully prays that this Court:

1. **Grant the writ of certiorari** to review the judgment of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in this matter;
2. **Reverse the judgment of the Court of Appeals**, thereby recognizing the procedural due process, equal protection, and excessive bail violations that occurred in Ms. Ray's case;
3. **Remand the case to the district court** for further proceedings consistent with the constitutional protections to which Ms. Ray is entitled;
4. **Grant such award other and further relief** as this Court deems and appropriate to safeguard

Ms. Ray's rights and prevent similar abuses from occurring in the future.

5. Deuteronomy 10:18 NKJV¹⁸ He administers justice for the fatherless and the widow, and loves the stranger, giving him food and clothing.
6. Exodus 22:22 NKJV²² "You shall not afflict any widow or fatherless child.
7. Zechariah 7:9-10 NKJV "*Administer true justice*; show mercy and compassion to one another. Do not oppress the widow or the fatherless, the foreigner or the poor"
8. ***My Dearest Supreme Court of the United States of America,***
9. My family prays you will accept our request for a Writ of Certiorari. In my book I Am Summoned to Testify by Masika Akilah, I wrote about our gut-wrenching experience of injustice by the police, sheriffs, and CPS departments, in Longview, Texas.
10. We love the Lord, have been saved by Jesus, and try to walk by the Fruit of the Spirit daily. I know God picked us because we are called to share our story so He will get the glory. ***As history repeats itself, now, I play the part of the persistent widow who desperately needs justice, Luke 18: 1-8.***
11. I will be quick. In 2016-2017, a preacher/contractor stole our money for my second house shortly after my husband had passed. He passed two days before our daughter's 5th birthday. A series of incidents occurred after that. Years later, when I tried to get my third home, I thought that I was going to be denied because there were three delays,

and I had a nervous breakdown. At the beginning of a spiritual warfare night, I had spanked my daughter for arguing with me about worldly views, a conversation we had had several times before. See, in my house, we will serve the Lord, and there is no challenge to that. My then 10-year-old daughter and a neighbor called 911; the police came, and that is where my tragic case began.

12. **Please Hear Our Cry for Justice and Rule in Our Favor.** That is my prayer. I pray you review my case and ask the lower court to send you everything. I have evidence: Ring videos of the police talking and acting in misconduct, proof of falsified documents, witnesses, and more. I am not only asking; I am begging. I am continuing to pray day and night for justice. I know the Lord is on my side. Like the Hebrew boys, Daniel and Job, whatever happens, I will still serve the Lord and remain humble. Yet, I have come too far to turn back now.
13. America is facing serious threats to our families from harmful forces that often disguise themselves as helpful—not all, but some. We must stay alert and recognize these influences to protect our loved ones and our communities. By being aware and united for the greater good, we can create a safer environment for everyone if we correct what we are aware of instead of ignoring it and allowing others to get hurt.
14. Additionally, I am helping others who are innocent and victims of CPS corruption at www.MyChildrenAreNotYourToys.com. If God is willing, I plan to speak to Congress and get

laws changed. Due to this affliction, I am now running for Congress in Texas District One to help innocent families. Please review our case, hear our cry for justice, and rule in our favor.

LAUS DEO.
Respectfully submitted,

Masika Brown Ray
312 Meadowlark Ln.
Longview, TX. 75603
MasikaRay@gmail.com
903-736-1238

March 3rd, 2025