

No. **24-5267**

**ORIGINAL**

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Supreme Court, U.S.  
FILED

**APR - 9 2024**

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

**RICHARD GEORGE BAXTER** — PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

vs.

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA** — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

**CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT**

(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

**RICHARD GEORGE BAXTER**  
(Your Name)

**1229 SHELTER CREEK LANE**  
(Address)

**SAN BRUNO, CA 94066**  
(City, State, Zip Code)

**650 875-1957**  
(Phone Number)

**RECEIVED**

**JUL - 3 2024**

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

**RECEIVED**

**MAY 24 2024**

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

**RECEIVED**

**JUL 19 2024**

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

i  
QUESTIONS PRESENTED

In Baxter Vs. Bortin, Schwartz, this court held that laws that "define fraud, embezzlement, and forgery by particular subject matter" are "obviously" content-based and "subject to strict scrutiny."

1. The first questions presented is whether a California law requiring fraud, embezzlement, and forgery are legitimate covering the court proceedings.

The government has the burden to "demonstrate that the harm it recites are real and That its restriction will in fact alleviate them to a material degree."

ii

2. The second question presented is whether the government can defeat an Amendment challenge.

iii  
PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING

Petitioner Richard George Baxter/Respondents Betty Claire Bortin, Sandra Schwartz, Esq.

iv  
TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
OPINIONS BELOW.....	1.
JURISDICTION.....	1.
PROVISION INVOLVED.....	1.
STATEMENT.....	2.

REASON FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

1. Does the argument present that a crime was committed suggesting fraud, embezzlement, and forgery.

A. Mortgage loan fraud, money stolen from inmate welfare fund, San Francisco Sheriff Department, forgery of mortgage documents.

B. Was there a fraudulent refinancing? How much was stolen from inmate welfare fund? Who committed forgery?

II A review of second argument of the brief.

A. There are no precedents concerning this case

B. Fraudulent notary, forged documents, amount (\$10,000,000.00) in inmate welfare fund/ mortgage worth \$138,000.00/

v

III Since there was at least \$10,000,000.00 in the inmate welfare fund there was no doubt over \$1,000,000.00 was stolen.

## PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Richard G. Baxter petitions for a writ of certiorari to review the judgment of the United States Supreme Court.

## OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the Court of Appeals is reported—to the opinion of the District Court.

## JURISDICTION

The U.S. Supreme Court entered its judgment—and ordered A timely filed petition for rehearing en banc, February 28, 2024.

## CONSTITUTION AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

The first Amendment to the United States Constitution that “Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech.”

## CONCLUSION TABLE OF APPENDICES

### APPENDIX A

Since fraud is a crime and there were two fraudulent refinancing out of four, there are Grounds to suggest or claim that a crime was committed. The same conclusion is with notary and forgery: Joe Perez falsely notarized forged documents concerning mortgage loan. Sandra Schwartz, Esq. Stole the money from the inmate welfare fund, while Betty Claire Bortin, Esq. paid Joe Perez to notarize the forgery. Therefore, there were three crimes committed: fraud, embezzlement, and forgery.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW .....	1
JURISDICTION.....	N/A
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED .....	N/A
STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....	11
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT .....	12
CONCLUSION.....	15

## INDEX TO APPENDICES

~~APPENDIX A~~

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

NO TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

STATUTES AND RULES

NO STATUTES OR RULES CITED

OTHER

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

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

OPINIONS BELOW

☐ For cases from **federal courts**:

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

☐ reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,

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

☒ is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix A 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 B to the petition and is

☐ reported at \_\_\_\_\_; or,

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

☒ is unpublished.

The opinion of the \_\_\_\_\_ court appears at Appendix 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 FEBRUARY 28, 2024

☐ 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 \_\_\_\_\_.  
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: \_\_\_\_\_, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_.

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

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

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION THAT INVOLVES FRAUD  
AND FORGERY.



## STATEMENT


Bank of America (mortgage loan) requested I contact their office for a "Title Search". There is no record of me buying my property November, 1994, at 1229 Shelter Creek Lane, San Bruno, CA 94066. Yet, my property was purchased through the Viet Nam G.I. Bill for Housing, Veterans Administration. The real estate office or title company was located in So. San Francisco, El Camino Real and Westborough. There is a discrepancy! Bank of America states that I refinanced in 2012 for a thirty year loan, \$138,050.00. This not true. I bought my property in November, 1994 and never refinanced in 2012. Bank of America also states that the loan will mature in 2042. Again this is not true. My loan will mature in 2024. It was a thirty year loan 1994, not 2012! I believe Betty Claire Bortin, Esq. collected equity on this fraudulent transaction. Besides forging my signature she had the forgery fraudulently notarized by a notary named Joe Perez, someone I don't know and I've never met, and never heard of. I paid \$500.00 down to secure the loan. The before mentioned is bank fraud, or real estate scam.

Also, Betty Claire Bortin, Esq. and I filed jointly through the IRS one year, we were married at the time. David Kobe, tax accountant, handled the filing (333 Hayes St., San Francisco, CA 94102) However I believe Betty Bortin, Esq. is guilty of tax evasion. Some sort of way she falsified the filing with Kobe and received a large tax return.

Betty Claire Bortin, Esq. and Sandra Schwartz, Esq. were given permission by former San Francisco Sheriff, Vicky Hennessy, to take money from the San Francisco Sheriff's Department inmate welfare fund in order to finance Hennessy's campaign for Sheriff. The inmate welfare fund contained \$10,000,000.00. That money transaction was embezzlement!. Betty Bortin, Esq. called me and said that Sandra Schwartz, Esq. had stolen money from the inmate welfare fund. Schwartz, Esq. finally told Sheriff Michael Hennessey and he said that it's alright as long as you pay the money back. Did Schwartz pay the money back? Schwartz also drew money from Unemployment Insurance while still working at San Francisco Sheriff's Department.

In retrospect, Betty Claire Bortin, Esq. introduced me to an Asian woman who was a senior manager for Bank of America. The woman bought Betty and I lunch and at the same time learned something about my banking busi-

ness. The two people, Betty Claire Bortin, Esq. and the bank manager were involved in a collusion to fraudulently refinance on my bank loan. This was all "white-collar" crime. Records show that I refinanced four times, 2001, 2003, 2007, and 2012. I recall refinancing twice, 2001, 2003, not 2007, and 2012. It's all a big fabrication



Richard George Baxter  
1229 Shelter Creek Lane  
San Bruno, CA 94066  
650 875-1957

~~11/15/11 11/15/11~~

~~11/15/11 11/15/11~~

~~11/15/11 11/15/11~~

STATEMENT CONTINUED  
SOCIOLOGICAL & HISTORICAL  
BRIEF

Poor African-American Black man who didn't know his father, yet has to fight his former wife, Betty Claire Bortin, Esq., who is Jewish and an attorney. Betty Bortin's deceased father was an attorney as well. He worked for the Labor Unions while swindling people. Betty Bortin was doubtful about crossing a picket-line at the old Alexandria Theater on Geary Boulevard in San Francisco, California. Betty Bortin once introduced me to an African-American real-estate broker who got his license with Bertty Bortin's father's help. The African-American broker tried to get \$50,000.00 dollars out of me for a house. What I'm saying is that Betty Bortin and the real-estate broker both knew how to swindle me out of my Vietnam G.I. Bill for Fair Housing by fraudulently refinancing on my mortgage loan. Joe Perez, a notary, notarized the forgery.

Like her deceased brother, Michael Bortin, Betty Bortin was a member of the Symbionez Liberation Army, however, Betty Bortin lied about her association with the SLA Betty Bortin has smoked marijuana in my presence. She is a "pot-head".

Richard Baxter  
1229 Shelter Creek Lane  
San Bruno, CA 94066  
650 875-1957

STATEMENT CONTINUED  
FAIR HOUSING BRIEF

Traditionally it was difficult getting a home loan because of discrimination. However, Betty Claire Bortin, Esq. took advantage of the situation and refinanced on my home loan without my knowledge or permission, FRAUD! (\$138, 050.00) Therefore, I have to pay a 30-year loan twice, and I have to fight for a settlement by Vice President Kamala Harris to gain "mortgage relief". Home owner's would be entitled to at least \$12 billion on the same "relief" plan.

Richard Baxter  
1229 Shelter Creek Ln  
San Bruno, CA 94066  
650 875-1957

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

VICTIM OF REFINANCING  
AND FORGERY

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

THIS COURT SHOULD GRANT CERTIORARI TO RESOLVE  
THE TENSION BETWEEN BAXTER V. UNITED STATES.

### CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard G. Baker

Date: APRIL 20, 2024