

No. 24-1298

In the
Supreme Court of the United States

ORIGINAL

HAROLD JEAN-BAPTISTE,

Petitioner,

FILED
APR 28 2025

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

v.

BOOZ ALLEN HAMILTON,

Respondent.

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the
United States Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Harold Jean-Baptiste
Petitioner Pro Se
253-37 148 Drive
Rosedale, NY 11422
(786) 657-8158
hbaptiste@influctec.com

April 28, 2025

SUPREME COURT PRESS

♦ (888) 958-5705 ♦

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

RECEIVED
JUN 23 2025

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

QUESTION PRESENTED

Can the Federal Government Judicial influence and the Courts interference to disregard all the rules of the Courts to protect a corporation from liability because of discrimination and Civil Rights violations collusion with Booz Allen Hamilton corporation and the Federal Bureau of Investigations to orchestrated the *modern-day lynching* of Blackman?

LIST OF PROCEEDINGS

U.S. Court of Appeals, District of Columbia Circuit
No. 24-7110

Harold Jean-Baptiste, *Appellant* v.
Booz Allen Hamilton, *Appellee*

Final Judgment: January 6, 2025
Rehearing Denial: March 18, 2025

U.S. District Court, District of Columbia
No. 22-cv-1499 (TNM)

Harold Jean-Baptiste, *Plaintiff* v.
Booz Allen Hamilton, *Defendant*
Final Opinion: July 26, 2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTION PRESENTED	i
LIST OF PROCEEDINGS	ii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	v
OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION.....	1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	2
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION.....	3
I. U.S. DISTRICT COURT APPLIED THE LAW INCORRECTLY.	4
II. DENIED FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHT TO PETITION.	6
III. ERRORS, MISTAKES, AND INEXCUSABLE NEGLECT.	11
IV. PUBLIC INTEREST.	16
CONCLUSION.....	18

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Continued

	Page
--	------

APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS**OPINIONS AND ORDERS**

Judgment, U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit (January 6, 2025)	1a
Order, U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit (December 23, 2024)	3a
Memorandum Opinion, U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia (July 26, 2024).....	4a
Order, U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia (July 26, 2024)	19a

REHEARING ORDER

Order Denying Petition for Rehearing En Banc, U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit (March 18, 2025)	21a
---	-----

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
CASES	
<i>Allen v. McCurry</i> , 449 U.S. 90 (1980)	6
<i>Arkansas Writers' Project, Inc. v. Ragland</i> , 481 U.S. 221 (1987)	15
<i>B.P. Steamboat Co. v. Norton</i> , 284 U.S. 408 (1932)	17
<i>Bill Johnson's Restaurants, Inc. v. Nat'l Labor Relations Bd.</i> , 461 U.S. 731 (1983)	8
<i>Boddie v. Connecticut</i> , 401 U.S. 371 (1971)	10
<i>Camara v. Municipal Court</i> , 387 U.S. 523 (1967)	17
<i>Cameron v. Seitz</i> , 38 F.3d 264 (1994)	12, 15
<i>Cooter Gell v. Hartmarx Corp.</i> , 496 U.S. 384 (1990)	5
<i>Doud v. Hodge</i> , 350 U.S. 485 (1956)	5
<i>Foley Bros. v. Filardo</i> , 336 U.S. 281 (1949)	6
<i>Forrester v. White</i> , 484 U.S. 219, 108 S.Ct. 538, 98 L.Ed.2d 555 (1988)	14
<i>Franco v. Kelly</i> , 854 F.2d 584 (2d Cir. 1988)	9
<i>Graham v. Connor</i> , 490 U.S. 386 (1989)	8

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

	Page
<i>Johnson v. Atkins</i> , 999 F.2d 99 (5th Cir. 1993)	10
<i>Krippendorf v. Hyde</i> , 110 U.S. 276 (1884)	12
<i>Liberty Warehouse Co. v. Grannis</i> , 273 U.S. 70 (1927)	6
<i>Lozman v. City of Riviera Beach</i> , 138 S.Ct. 1945 (2018)	8, 10
<i>Maness v. Meyers</i> , 419 U.S. 449 (1975)	12
<i>Maxwell v. Dow</i> , 176 U.S. 581 (1900)	5
<i>Milwaukie & M. R. Co. v. Soutter</i> , 69 U.S. 510 (1864)	13
<i>Nat'l Archives & Records Admin. v. Favish</i> , 541 U.S. 157 (2004)	16
<i>Payne v. Tennessee</i> , 501 U.S. 808, 111 S.Ct. 2597, 115 L.Ed.2d 720 (1991)	14
<i>Pearson v. Welborn</i> , 471 F.3d 732 (7th Cir. 2006)	9
<i>Railroad Company v. Soutter</i> , 69 U.S. 510 (1864)	7
<i>Railroad Trainmen v. Virginia Bar</i> , 377 U.S. 1 (1964)	8
<i>Rosales-Mireles v. United States</i> , 138 S.Ct. (1897)	13

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

	Page
<i>Silva v. Vittorio</i> , 658 F.3d 1090 (9th Cir. 2011)	10
<i>Snyder v. Nolen</i> , 380 F.3d 279 (7th Cir. 2004)	9
<i>Steel Co. v. Citizens for Better Env’t</i> , 523 U.S. 83 (1998)	5
<i>Stein v. New York</i> , 346 U.S. 156 (1953)	13
<i>Stringfellow v. Concerned Neighbors in Action</i> , 480 U.S. 370 (1987)	9
<i>United States v. City of New Orleans</i> , 947 F.Supp.2d 601 (E.D. La. 2013).....	15
<i>United States v. Olano</i> , 507 U.S. 725 (1993)	11
<i>United States v. Vann</i> , 660 F.3d 771 (CA4 2011).....	14
<i>Watson v. City of Kansas City, Kansas</i> , Civil Action No. 99-2106-CM (D. Kan. Apr. 12, 2002)	15
<i>Will v. Hallock</i> , 546 U.S. 345 (2006)	17
<i>Will v. United States</i> , 389 U.S. 90 (1967)	6
<i>Wilson v. Thompson</i> , 593 F.2d 1375 (5th Cir. 1979)	9

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

	Page
CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS	
U.S. Const. amend. I.....	3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10
U.S. Const. amend. IV	8
U.S. Const. amend. V.....	10
U.S. Const. amend. XIV.....	9, 10, 11, 13
U.S. Const. art. III	5
STATUTES	
28 U.S.C. § 1254(1)	1
28 U.S.C. § 1291.....	4
28 U.S.C. § 1292.....	4
28 U.S.C. § 1295.....	4
JUDICIAL RULES	
D.C. Cir. R. 6(b)(ii)	11
D.C. Cir. R. 15(b)(2)	11
Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(1).....	15



OPINIONS BELOW

The judgement of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia was entered on March 18, 2025, the U.S. Court of Appeals affirmed the U.S. District Court ruling based on the government influence, Judicial inference, bias or influence to ignore all the rules of the Court. As result of the nature of the case and the Respondent collusion with the Federal Bureau of Investigations to destroy the Petitioner's life and because of the nature of the case involves the FBI the Courts interference denied a fair hearing and going to a jury trial would be too shameful for the FBI. U.S. Court of Appeals ruling lack legal judgement and clearly Judicial interference and bias for a fair hearing. The Petitioner files a petition for a Writ of Certiorari to correct the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia base Judicial interference and inexcusable neglect. The Petition for a writ of certiorari was filed to correct Judicial bias of the U.S. Court of Appeals.



JURISDICTION

The D.C. Circuit denied a timely filed petition for rehearing on March 18, 2025. (App.21a). The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).



STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The Petitioner filed a complaint in U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia individually on behalf of himself against Booz Allen Hamilton, who discriminated against the Petitioner, subjected to a Human Rights and Civil Rights violations. The FBI attempted murder and kidnapping the Petitioner to prevent the exposure of this case in Federal Court and to protect Booz Allen Hamilton from liability. The Respondent purposely and willfully violated the Plaintiff's Civil Rights in his work place with the collusion of a now known white supremacy group within the FBI, well document in Supreme Court case #21-1175. The U.S. District Court of the District of Columbia dismiss the lawsuit without merit despite the overwhelming evidence in the complaint and the influence on the Court by the federal government to prevent this case from going to trial, to prevent the exposure of the shameful acts done by the Respondent collusion with FBI.

The Petitioner appealed the ruling to U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, to overturn the errors of the U.S. District Court but the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia affirmed the U.S. District Court ruling based Judicial interference and bias. The Petitioner prays the Supreme Court overturn the errors of U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and reinstate the Petitioner's due process and hold the Respondent accountable. Most importantly to maintain the integrity and independence of Judicial System and set a precedence to ensure that rule of law matters, a fair Judicial process and

make sure this never ever happens to someone else in the future.

The Writ of Certiorari is before the Supreme Court on the merits the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia applied the law incorrectly, denied due process, First Amendment Right to Petition, unfair Judicial review, error, mistake, inexcusable neglect and public interest. The Judicial Branch is the check and balance to government behavior and must be independent from government influence and the Courts must stand firm and hold anyone accountable for violation the law, even if the case involves a government institution, one set rule of law applies to everyone before the Court. A corporation (Booz Allen Hamilton) should not discriminate and violate the law in the cruelest way possible with the collusion of the FBI and it's a blasphemy of justice that the most esteem Judicial System in the world to not adhere to influence, Judicial inference and bias and not hold the Respondent accountable or liable because embarrassment the nature of the case.



REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

The Petitioner contends that the Supreme Court should grant Writ of Certiorari to review the cases based on the inexcusable error of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, the U.S. Court of Appeals applied the law incorrectly, unfair Judicial review, denial of First Amendment Right to Petition, error, mistake and inexcusable neglect. The U.S. Court of Appeals decision on this case was flawed

based on Judicial neglect and interference. The Petitioner filed the lawsuit to seek justice and fair Judicial review, based on the oath of service taken by every Judge in the United States in all Courts. The U.S. Court of Appeals denying the Petitioner's due process when proper jurisdiction exists is a grave injustice by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. Regardless if the Petitioner is "Pro Se", the First Amendment Right to Petition and fair Judicial review should not be obstructed the U.S. Court of Appeals and prays the Supreme Court grant a review and correct the improper application of the law and set a precedence the Plaintiff is a human being and Courts cannot protect a corporate institution that tried to destroy an American Citizen's life with collusion of the FBI, the government influence and the Courts interference and bias is a *blasphemy of justice*.

I. U.S. DISTRICT COURT APPLIED THE LAW INCORRECTLY.

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia applied the law incorrectly by dismissing the case for frivolous reasons, when the case was appeal on under jurisdiction of 28 U.S.C. § 1291, 28 U.S.C. § 1292 and 28 U.S.C. § 1295. Even early in the Judicial System the Supreme Court stated,

one system of law in one portion of its territory and another system in another, provided it did not encroach upon the proper jurisdiction of the United States, nor abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws in the same district, nor deprive him of his rights without due process of law

Maxwell v. Dow, 176 U.S. 581, 598 (1900).

The U.S. Court of Appeals should apply one system of law for every case present before the Court, U.S. Court of Appeals failure to recognized violation of law and the clear evidence of facts on this case, was an error of judgement and applied the law incorrectly based on Judicial interference and bias because of the ugly nature of the case. “The Court has no authority to enact rules that “abridge, enlarge or modify any substantive right.” *Ibid.* Pursuant to this authority, the Court promulgated the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to “govern the procedure in the United States district courts in all suits of a civil nature”, *see Cooter Gell v. Hartmarx Corp.*, 496 U.S. 384, 391 (1990).

The U.S. Court of Appeals applied the law incorrectly; the proper ruling of the case is within the U.S. Court of Appeals jurisdiction and to obstruct the Court jurisdiction is applying the law incorrectly and Judicial error. The Supreme Court stated, “cases must be acknowledged to have diluted the absolute purity of the rule that Article III jurisdiction is always an antecedent question, none of them even approaches approval of a doctrine of “hypothetical jurisdiction” that enables a court to resolve contested questions of law”, *see Steel Co. v. Citizens for Better Env’t*, 523 U.S. 83, 101 (1998). The Supreme Court stated when “the District Court has jurisdiction of this cause. It was error to dismiss the complaint for lack of jurisdiction, *see Doud v. Hodge*, 350 U.S. 485, 487 (1956).

The Supreme Court stated, “acting within its proper jurisdiction, has given the parties a full and fair opportunity to litigate federal claims, and thereby

has shown itself willing and able to protect federal rights", *see Allen v. McCurry*, 449 U.S. 90, 104 (1980).

The U.S. Court of Appeals error in ruling was not based on any facts but Judicial bias and violated the Petitioner's fundamental rights for due process and a fair Judicial review. The Supreme Court stated, "traditional purpose of confining a district court to a lawful exercise of its jurisdiction or to compel it to exercise its proper jurisdiction", *see Will v. United States*, 389 U.S. 90, 95 n.2 (1967). The Supreme Court stated, even if such difficulties may not be insuperable, vexing problems of courts with proper jurisdiction of the law must be applied correctly, *see Foley Bros. v. Filardo*, 336 U.S. 281, 299 (1949). The Supreme Court stated, "That Judicial power, as we have seen, is the right to determine actual controversies arising between adverse litigants, duly instituted in courts of proper jurisdiction", *see Liberty Warehouse Co. v. Grannis*, 273 U.S. 70, 75 (1927). The U.S. Court of Appeals had proper jurisdiction failed to apply the law accordingly when proper jurisdiction of law existed, that failure to apply the law correctly was Judicial error.

II. DENIED FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHT TO PETITION.

The freedom of petition clause guarantees that Americans can petition a powerful corporate institution, or individual to redress their grievances without fear of retribution or punishment. This was an important principle valued by the Founding Fathers, in orchestrating the laws that govern the Court. The freedom of petition clause played an important role in the Civil Rights petition for every person in America. At the earliest occurrence in the Judicial System, the Court stated,

It is a right which the party can claim; and if he shows himself entitled to it on the facts in the record, there is no discretion in the Court to withhold it. A refusal is error — Judicial error — which this Court is bound to correct when the matter, as in this instance, is fairly before it. That the order asked for by Petitioner should have been granted, seems to us very clear

Railroad Company v. Soutter, 69 U.S. 510, 522 (1864).

Booz Allen Hamilton collectively tried to destroy a life of an American Citizen with the collusion of now know white supremacy group within the FBI and why in the world would the Courts not want to hold the Respondent accountable outside of government influence and Judicial inference plus bias. The nature of the Complaints is too shameful to be expose in trial; hence the Courts interference and bias to not provide fair due process. It's a grave injustice where the Courts did not hold its independence from influence and deny justice of such a gruesome act by the Petitioner's employer, this can only mean how guilty the Respondent is, hence the motive for the Judicial interference and bias in the Courts ruling. It's imperative that in a democratic society or the experience of having a democracy the Courts must be independent from the influence of the government to suppress justice and to maintain the fabric of a democratic society. The definition Justice must not mean justice anymore, we should just say it, if a corporate institution can commit the ugliest act to a setup some for arrest with the FBI and the Courts ignore the rules of the Courts to protect the Respondent,

our democratic republic is lost forever and many more modern-day lynchings will take place.

The Supreme Court should overturn the ruling of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and state “when was the Plaintiff not a human being” that his life did not matter for justice, and the Courts lost faith in justice to shelter crimes committed on a Blackman in American, by a corporate and government institution, it's just sad to conceive. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia ruling was sugar coated and what the ruling really said was “you're black human being in American and your life is insignificant”. Past precedence of the Court stated, “We hold that such claims are properly analyzed under the Fourth Amendment’s “objective reasonableness” standard, rather than under a substantive due process standard”, *see Graham v. Connor*, 490 U.S. 386, 388 (1989).

Having the Right to Petition and due process is guiding the foundation for the Judicial System, to obstruct that would derail the guiding principles of foundation the democracy is built on. Past Courts stated, “we recognized that the right of access to the Courts is an aspect of the First Amendment Right to Petition”, *see Bill Johnson's Restaurants, Inc. v. Nat'l Labor Relations Bd.*, 461 U.S. 731, 741 (1983). The obstruction of the Right to Petition by past Court stated, “The Right to Petition the Courts cannot be so handicapped”, *see Railroad Trainmen v. Virginia Bar*, 377 U.S. 1, 7 (1964). “It must be underscored that this Court has recognized the “Right to Petition as one of the most precious of the liberties safeguarded by the Bill of Rights”, *see Lozman v. City of Riviera Beach*, 138 S.Ct. 1945, 1954 (2018).

The U.S. Court of Appeals ruling hindered the Petitioner's right to due process before the Court, therefore depriving the Petitioner's First Amendment Right to Petition. Past Court stated, "to any original party or intervenor of right seeking relief from extraordinarily prejudicial interlocutory orders, including the right to appeal from a final judgment and the Right to Petition", *see Stringfellow v. Concerned Neighbors in Action*, 480 U.S. 370, 385 (1987).

The U.S. Court of Appeals impeded the Petitioner's Right to Petition is an abuse of the Judicial System guidelines for providing a fair Judicial review for a Petitioner, therefore the Supreme Court should not allow this abuse of the Judicial System and set a precedence to correct it. According to past Court, "the right of access to the Courts, the Right to Petition is substantive rather than procedural and therefore "cannot be obstructed, regardless of the procedural means applied", *see Franco v. Kelly*, 854 F.2d 584, 589 (2d Cir. 1988). Most importantly past Court stated, "The right of individuals to pursue legal redress for claims that have a reasonable basis in law or fact is protected by the First Amendment Right to Petition and the Fourteenth Amendment right to substantive due process", *see Snyder v. Nolen*, 380 F.3d 279, 291 (7th Cir. 2004). Nothing in the First Amendment itself suggests that the First Amendment Right to Petition for redress of grievances only attaches when the petitioning takes a specific form, *see Pearson v. Welborn*, 471 F.3d 732, 741 (7th Cir. 2006).

It is by now well established that access to the Courts is protected by the First Amendment Right to Petition for redress of grievances, *see Wilson v. Thompson*, 593 F.2d 1375, 1387 (5th Cir. 1979). The

Supreme Court stated, “held that the First Amendment Right to Petition the government includes the right to file other civil actions in Court that have a reasonable basis in law or fact”, *see Silva v. Vittorio*, 658 F.3d 1090, 1102 (9th Cir. 2011). “Meaningful access to the Courts is a fundamental Constitutional Right, grounded in the First Amendment Right to Petition and the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendment due process clauses”, *see Johnson v. Atkins*, 999 F.2d 99, 100 (5th Cir. 1993).

The United States Supreme Court has recognized “the Right to Petition as one of the most precious of the liberties safeguarded by the Bill of Rights”, *see Lozman v. City of Riviera Beach*, 138 S.Ct. 1945 (1946). The Supreme Court should look at the gravity of allegations and to deny a “Pro Se” Petitioner from having due process before the Court and the severity of the allegations by the Respondent and denying the Petitioner’s right to due process and implies the respondent is above the law and can get away with trying to destroy the life of an American Citizen. The Supreme Court stated, “At its core, the right to due process reflects a fundamental value in our American constitutional system. Our understanding of that value is the basis upon which we have resolved”, *see Boddie v. Connecticut*, 401 U.S. 371, 374 (1971).

The Supreme Court should examine more precisely the weight of First Amendment Right to Petition by the Constitution, the calamity of the Federal Laws violations presented by the Petitioner who is filing “Pro Se” the opportunity to present the case before the Court to grant the Petitioner’s due process. First, the risk of an erroneous deprivation of the law since the respondent never responded or gave notice of appear-

ance to the U.S. Court of Appeals, therefore the U.S. Court of Appeals should have issued an order of default judgment since the respondent failed to respond in 14 days “after receiving a docketing notice from the circuit clerk” and no notice of appearance according to *Cir Rules U.S. Court of Appeals for District of Columbia Circuit rule 6(b)(ii)*. According to *Cir Rules U.S. Court of Appeals for District of Columbia Circuit rule 15(b)(2)* the Respondent never responded in 21 days and the U.S. Court of Appeals failed to enter judgement for the relief requested, why would the Court ignore all the rules of the Court outside of Judicial interference and bias. The Petitioner’s fair due process was denied, and the concept of the Judicial System is to provide a fair Judicial review; the U.S. Court of Appeals ruling was an error to deny the Petitioner’s right to due process in applying the law correctly and fair due process.

III. ERRORS, MISTAKES, AND INEXCUSABLE NEGLECT.

The U.S. Court of Appeals ignored the rule of the Court and made an error in judgment to affirm the lower Court ruling, which was inexcusable neglect. The U.S. Court of Appeals clearly had jurisdiction to correct the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, not doing so was inexcusable error and neglect. The errors, mistakes and inexcusable neglect by the U.S. Court of Appeals denied the Petitioner a fair Judicial review. In *United States v. Olano*, 507 U.S. 725 (1993), the U.S. Supreme Court established three conditions that must be met before a Court may consider exercising its discretion to correct the error. First, there must be an error that has not been intentionally relinquished or abandoned. Second, the error must be plain—that is to say, clear, or obvious.

Third, the error must have affected the Petitioner substantial rights. To satisfy this third condition, the Petitioner ordinarily must show a reasonable probability that, but for the error, the outcome of the proceedings would have been different, as noted in *Cameron v. Seitz*, 38 F.3d 264 (1994).

The U.S. Court of Appeals actions were a clear error and affected the outcome of the Judicial proceeding. Prior Courts stated, “Remedies for Judicial error may be cumbersome but the injury flowing from an error generally is not irreparable, and orderly processes are imperative to the operation of the adversary system of justice”, *see Maness v. Meyers*, 419 U.S. 449, 460 (1975). Prior Court have stated “the Court must view the evidence in a light most favorable to the party against whom the motion is made and give that party the benefit of all reasonable inferences”, *see Cameron v. Seitz*, 38 F.3d 264 (1994). The Supreme Court stated,

The equitable powers of Courts of law over their own process to prevent abuse, oppression, and injustice are inherent and equally extensive and efficient, as is also their power to protect their own jurisdiction. . . . In whatever form, the remedy is administered, whether according to a procedure in equity or at law, the rights of the parties will be preserved and protected against Judicial error, and the final decree or judgment will be reviewable, by appeal or writ of error, according to the nature of the case

Krippendorf v. Hyde, 110 U.S. 276 (1884).

U.S. Const. amend. XIV does not guarantee due process, assure immunity from Judicial error. It is only miscarriages of such gravity and magnitude that they cannot be expected to happen in an enlightened system of justice, or be tolerated by it if they do, that cause the Court to intervene to review, in the name of the federal constitution.

Stein v. New York, 346 U.S. 156 (1953).

The Supreme Court stated,

It is a right which the party can claim; and if he shows himself entitled to it on the facts in the record, there is no discretion in the Court to withhold it. A refusal is error—Judicial error—which this Court is bound to correct when the matter, as in this instance, is fairly before it.

Milwaukie & M. R. Co. v. Souter, 69 U.S. 510 (1864).

The Supreme Court stated,

That risk of unnecessary deprivation of liberty particularly undermines the fairness, integrity, or public reputation of Judicial proceedings in the context of a plain guidelines error because guideline's miscalculations ultimately result from Judicial error, as the District Court is charged in the first instance with ensuring the Guidelines range it considers is correct.

Rosales-Mireles v. United States, 138 S.Ct. (1897).

Prior Court stated, "The doctrine of stare decisis allows us to revisit an earlier decision where experience

with its application reveals that it is unworkable,” *see Payne v. Tennessee*, 501 U.S. 808, 827, 111 S.Ct. 2597, 115 L.Ed.2d 720 (1991). The U.S. Court of Appeals errors on the case is unworkable because the ruling on the case was not applied to rules and law that governs the Court. Prior Court ruling on errors stated, “Experience is all the more instructive when the decision in question rejected a claim of unconstitutional vagueness. Unlike other Judicial mistakes that need correction, the error of having rejected a vagueness challenge manifests itself precisely in subsequent Judicial decisions: ‘a black hole of confusion and uncertainty’ that frustrates any effort to impart “some sense of order and direction”, *see United States v. Vann*, 660 F.3d 771, 787 (CA4 2011).

The U.S. Court of Appeals did not follow the law correctly; the Courts created a sense of confusion in the ruling the Supreme Court can provide clarity on how the Court should follow the rule of law that governs the Judicial System and reverse the U.S. Court of Appeals Order and apply the law correctly. “It is a judge’s duty to decide all cases within his jurisdiction that are brought before him. . . . His errors may be corrected on appeal, but he should not have to fear that unsatisfied litigants may hound him with litigation”, *see Forrester v. White*, 484 U.S. 219, 227, 108 S.Ct. 538, 98 L.Ed.2d 555 (1988).

Prior Court have provided insights on evaluating Judicial neglect, “To determine whether any of a judge’s actions were taken outside his Judicial capacity, the “nature of the act” is examined, *i.e.*, whether it is a function normally performed by a judge, and to the expectations of the parties, *i.e.*, whether they dealt

with the judge in his Judicial capacity”, *see Cameron v. Seitz*, 38 F.3d 264 (1994).

Prior Court stated, “Judicial error, is the requirement that judges write opinions providing logical reasons for treating one situation differently from another”, *see Arkansas Writers’ Project, Inc. v. Ragland*, 481 U.S. 221, 235 (1987). The U.S. Court of Appeals never provide any explanation or logical reasons for treating the Petitioner differently when applying the rules that govern the Court. Prior Court stated, “Rule 60(b)(1) “may be invoked for the correction of Judicial error, but only to rectify an obvious error of law, apparent on the record”, *see United States v. City of New Orleans*, 947 F.Supp.2d 601, 624 (E.D. La. 2013).

Past Court stated, “facially obvious” Judicial error in its decision and finds that the factual and legal conclusions in the court’s order are “arguable.” Therefore, relief is unavailable under Rule 60(b)(1)”, *see Watson v. City of Kansas City, Kansas*, Civil Action No. 99-2106-CM, at *18 (D. Kan. Apr. 12, 2002) The U.S. Court of Appeals Judicial interference applied the law different, made an error and ignored the rules of the Court, therefore inexcusable neglect by the U.S. Court of Appeals. The U.S. Court of Appeals actions on the case were uncharacteristic of sound legal judgment and it is inexcusable neglect by the U.S. Court of Appeals and denied the Petitioner a fair Judicial review. The U.S. Court of Appeals made a mistake, error and inexcusable neglect in applying the law correctly, by not issuing default judgment since the respondent did not appear before the U.S. Court of Appeals, and the ruling was an error without clear legal merit or respect for the rule law that govern the U.S. Court of Appeals.

IV. PUBLIC INTEREST.

It's in the public interest that the Supreme Court apply the law correctly as a result of the respondent failure to appear before the U.S. Court of Appeals or gave notice of appearance to the U.S. Court of Appeals therefore the rule of law must be applied accordingly based on the rules of the U.S. Court of Appeals. According to the rules of the Court non-appearance in the U.S. Court of Appeals is subjected to default judgment or provide the Petitioner a full fact-finding Judicial review. It's in public interest that the Supreme Court maintained the integrity of the Judicial System because the rule of law matters, and law-abiding straightforward rulings must always be considered when applying the law and to ensure that errors of the U.S. Court of Appeals are corrected and maintain Judicial equality. It's in the public interest that the Supreme Court set a precedence that the Courts must be independent of influence and must follow the rules of the Court for ruling on any cases and to reinstated the confidence in the Court to protect the public interest strong faith in an independent Judicial System, that the Court ruling is based on fact of the law, not Judicial bias base on Judicial influence by the government.

The Supreme Court stated,

[t]he balancing exercise in some other case might require us to make a somewhat more precise determination regarding the significance of the public interest and the historical importance of the events in question.

Nat'l Archives & Records Admin. v. Favish, 541 U.S. 157, 175 (2004).

It's in the public interest that the Supreme Court intervene in matters that would set a good precedence for the public interest to uphold the rule of law in the Judicial System and that any errors of the lower Courts will be corrected by the Supreme Court and prevent Judicial bias or inexcusable neglect. It is not mere avoidance of a trial, but avoidance of a trial that would imperil a substantial public interest, that counts when asking whether an order is "effectively" unreviewable or hinder the public interest to prevent the similar allegations in this case, *see Will v. Hallock*, 546 U.S. 345, 353 (2006). When factors are profoundly serious violation of law by a party it's the Court duty to consider the effect of the public interest, in the public interest and should be construed liberally in furtherance of their purpose and, if possible, so as to avoid incongruous results, *see B.P. Steamboat Co. v. Norton*, 284 U.S. 408 (1932).

In applying any reasonableness standard, including one of constitutional dimension, an argument that the public interest demands a particular rule must receive careful consideration, the effect of obliviousness to factors that would protect the public interest would be a stain to the Court function in the society, *see Camara v. Municipal Court*, 387 U.S. 523, 533 (1967). It's in the public interest that Supreme Court set the precedence the Courts must be independent of government influence and does not let Judicial interference and bias effects the Courts rulings. Fundamental to a Democratic Republic the Court must hold firm of its impendence and not deteriorate guiding principles the Judicial Branch stands for and it's imperative the Judicial System must be impartial of

influence and all rulings are based on facts of the law and Judicial honor to not be bias.



CONCLUSION

The Petitioner prays a writ of certiorari is granted to correct the errors of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and not let the Booz Allen Hamilton get away with trying to destroy an American Citizen's life. When was the Petitioner not a human being before the Court or all the stars in the Universe must have exploded in supernova or burned out for the most esteemed Judicial System in the world to not hold the Respondent before the Courts accountable for violation of the law to try to destroy the life of Blackman and Human Rights violations in the worst way imaginable. Outside of Judicial interference, bias or government influence on the Courts to suppress justice and not go to a jury trial, what is another rational conclusion it can be for the Court to ignore all the rules that govern it.

The duty of the Courts in our society is to be non-bias, independent of government influence and powerful corporate institution accountable regardless of nature of the case and no intuition have the privilege or law backing them to try to destroy an American Citizen's life at will. The nature of the case is an insult to humanity that the Courts would not want justice to prevail in a society of rules of law that apply to everyone. The Plaintiff prays the Supreme Court imposes its independence and correct the Courts Judicial interference and bias and hold the

Respondent accountable to prevent this experience from happening to someone else in the future. The Last time the Petitioner checked he was a human being not a slave to be setup for arrest and this modern-day lynching of Blackman in American and it's a travesty and blasphemy of justice for the Courts to not honor its independence and rules that govern the Courts and hold the Respondent accountable when it violates the law because fundamental to our Democratic Republic core value the Judicial Branch is independent and no one is above the law.

Respectfully submitted,

Harold Jean-Baptiste
Petitioner Pro Se
253-37 148 Drive
Rosedale, NY 11422
(786) 657-8158
hbaptiste@influctec.com

April 28, 2025