

24-5276

No.

FILED

MAY 05 2024

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

IN THE

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Washington D.C.

Rhoda Stahmann Nielsen PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

VS

Christopher Wray → RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

U.S Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit  
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE) Chicago IL

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

Rhoda ~~Nelsen~~ Nelsen  
(Your Name)

301 Brooklyn St Apt #5  
(Address)

Berlin WI 54923  
(City, State, Zip Code)

920-594-2762  
(Phone Number)

## (I) Questions Presented

\*The Defendant Violated the Most Important US Supreme Law of the Land. Violation of His U.S Official Director of the FBI. Christopher Wray Violated his duties to Enforce Law under a Supervisory Role. Given the Direction for allowing Employee Misconduct Under 18 U.S.C s 242 an employee of Oath, of Authority "Collar of Law Division" that Enforces a Persons Civil Rights. Violation Christopher Ways Authority, allowed his employee to Violate his Job Duties and Commit a Crime 18 U.S.C s 1001 903. Survey of a white Collar Crime 32 AM Crim L Rev 137,323 346(1995) sec 101 Obermaier and 12 morillo, white Collar Crime Business and Regulator Offense s 10.02(1990 discussing sec 1001) 1341,1343 Provisions 9-42,010- Coordination of Chap 9-42.001. Concealing false documents and statements at the Agency.

Fact Beyond Importance, violation Caused Deprivation of Life. Violation Caused false Imprisonment 11.404 (Ett V.Linn-Mar.. Sch Dis 656 N.W 2d IWOW. Violation Fact Beyond Importance, Violation 811.034 Statues Online Sunshine (1) Legislative Intent(A)(B),

Definitions(a) Communicate(b) obtain (c) property 3 service (d) scheme to Defraud & value(4)offenses(a) any person who engages in scheme to defraud and obtains Property Guilty of Organized Fraud (D) Provisions Law a Criminal action or Civil Proceeding under this section may be Commenced at any time. Sec1983 violation 18 U.S.C Conspired in a Judicial statutory Scheme, violation all his Duties Held in Office. Failed to Intervene, failed to report Illegal use of the US Territory and Sectors done by Government and Law Officials violated his Official Role Acting for the U.S Director of the Fbi, upon National Security Due to the Violation was Security Fraud Done by Global Business, that use Capabilities of the US Intelligence. Dose this Violation Break Law under1983 right to the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment to be enforced, by law of proscute and grant relief under rule 60(b)(1)

Rhoda Stahmann- VS- Christopher Wray Case Numbers 23-cv-1724 U.S Eastern District Court & Case # 24-1079 Appeals Court 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit Chicago IL.

\*28 U.S.C 636c Fed rule Procedure 73(b) Clarify Discrepancies filling...App... (App(B) 23-cv-1724(App(A) 24-1079

\*Violation Judicial Scheme Special Provisions(B) Sec 8315(Cross ref sec 5525- 5529)...App...(App(B)23-cv-1724 App(A) 24-1079

\*Violation Federalist 78 Presented Document filled with Violation of Statutory Interpretation,Pargmatism,78 federalist,80 Pragmatist(Sec2-301 Code Civil Procedure(735 ILCS 512-301(West 1998)...App...(App (B) 23-cv-1724 App(A)24-1079

\*Violation Civil Right Act 6ID & 7ID Characterization of the extent of official Immunity was not Uncontroversial....App..... (App(B)23-cv-1724(App(A)24-1079

\*Violation of Statutory Scheme under (issues State) Sec 1983 under US 149 11)20 US 150,US 149 s 20 11 Georgia Law, US 148 state rights Guaranteed by the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment for purpose of Federal Jurisdiction, the Doctrine History(Barney V City of New York,Supra Which ruled otherwise although Question Has never been Over ruled....App..... (App(B)23-cv-1724(App(A)24-1079

\*Violation 18 U.S.C 242 Deprivation of Life.....App.... (App(B)23-cv-1724 App(A)24-1079

\*Violation Equal Rights Protections...App..... (App(B)23-cv-1724App(A)24-1079

\*US Constitution is a Supreme Law of the Land -No Federal Law(Statue) Enacted by the U.S Congress Must be Followed by every state in the County is one of the requirements by code of Ethics &Provisions, violation working for the U.S (App(B)23-cv-1724 App(A) 24-1079

\*Violation 18 U.S.C 245 (a) failed to uphold this Provisions of Law(Fact beyond Importance....App.....(App.....App(B)23-cv-1724 App(A) 24-1079

## (I)Questions presented

\*Violation 18 U.S.C 245 Federal Protected Activities (A)(1) following Impeachment Rule 607(B)..App.. (App.....App(B)23-cv-1724 App(A)24-1079

\*Violation 201 General Rule Art II Rule 201(b)(4).App.....App(B)23-cv-1724 App(A) 24-1079

\*Violation (A) General Rule 609 Evidence of Conviction of a Crime(Doc 5) Clear Evidence a US Crime Committed Statutory Scheme Legislative Text(Socorro Ramires VS Hon Court of Appeal & Esther Gardy G.R No 93833 September 25,1995, 293 SCRA 590 (Cites true Intent) Commissioner of Customs VS-ESSO Standard Ester,IC 66 SCRA 113 (975 Sec6)....App....App(B) 23-cv-1724 App(A)24-1079

\*Violation 18 U.S.C Sec 1594(b) 7(c) Conspiracy(Extra territorial Jurisdiction)  
...App.....App(B)23-cv-1723 App(A)24-1079

\*Violation US Civil Protections Act...App...App(B)23-cv-1724App(A)24-1079

\*Violations U.S Civil Right Act(Civil Liberties Sec2 Policy Sec1361 18 U.S.C....App.....App(B)23-cv-1724,App 24-1079

\*Failure to Intervene-...App....App(B)23-cv-1723..App(A)24-1079

\*Failure to Intervene Under the 13<sup>th</sup>,14<sup>th</sup>,15<sup>th</sup>, Amendment Passage of Reconstruction Amendments that gave the Court Authority to Intervene(Torres V Supereintendant of Police Puerto Rico Establish Liability, this Doctrine that follows the Court. This Clearly State (See Sec 42& 47 of Civil right Act 6ID & 7ID at 580 this gave Characterization of the extent of official immunity was not Uncontroversial. (Note Affect a Outcome of a Discretion filled Caused Judicial Scheme Under Special Provisions (B) Section 8315(Cross ref sec 5525-5529)

App...App(B)23-cv-1724 App(A)24-1079

\*Violation of Federal Protected Rights...App.....App(B)23-cv-1724 App(A) 24-1079

\*Violation of Protecting Human Rights Law By Policy.....App.....App(B)23-cv-1724 App(A)24-1079

\*Violation US 151 s 20...App.....App(B)23-cv-1724 App(A) 24-1079

\*Internal Operating Procedure (See Fed R App 47 Fed Cir 47( c) ..App....App(B)23-cv-1724 App(A)24-1079

\*US 153 Judicial Inclusion & Exclusion (Davidson V New Orleans,96 U.S 97 96 U.S 104..App.....App(B)23-cv-1724 App(A)24-1079

\*Statutory Scheme Legislative Text(Scalia & Garner. Supa Note at XXVII...App....App(B)23-cv-1724 App(A) 24-1079

\*18 U.S.C 241 (1) Deprivation of Rights Privilages or Immunities secured or Protected by the Federal Constitution...App...App(B)23-cv-1724 App(A) 24-1079

\*Violations, Arise of a Individual of authority that was given Job duties, for the U.S Director FBI Agency, Christopher Wray. U.S Const Art.I s3,C17 Lacking an express Constitutional Provision, Defendant hang his Textual Argument for Immunity on Impeachment "Judgement Clause" but it cannot bear the weight he Places on it, the defendant is not President.

Clause 1 -limits the Penalties of Impeachment to removal Disqualification from office.

\*OLC Double Jeopardy Memo" Citing 2 Joseph Story, Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States 251-2(1833 reprint 1994)

\*Clause 2 "That the Impeachment limits do not Preclude "The Party Convicted from later Criminal Prosecution in the Courts I.e that further Punishment (see ID \*10)

\* Citing Both Clause Undercut Defendant Interpretation of it -Define the Clause Scope:

\*OLC Immunity Memo at \*2(citing Amenability of the President, vice President and other Civil Officers to Federal Criminal Prosecution while in office (1973 OLC Memo")

(I) Question Presented

\*Clause Manifest purpose and originally understood effect-was therefore to Permit Criminal Prosecution in Spite Prior Adjudication by the Senate, i.e..

\*Double Jeopardy argument ID (Citation Omitted) (See infra Section V.B

\*Federalist No.69 at 348-

\*Federalist No 77 at 392, Immunity motion at 12, Clause Clarification that Prosecution may follow Impeachment, they don't have to happen in that order.

\*Second "Defendant "Cites Founding Father James Wilson remark during ratification debates [the Laws] In Private character as a citizen in his Public Character by Impeachment Federal Constitution 480(2ed. 1863)

\*\*\*These Questions Support the Petition of Writ of Certiorari Rhoda Stahmann VS Christopher Wray Case Filed 23-cv-1724 U.S Eastern District Court Dec26th 2023 in Person. On Jan 18<sup>th</sup>,2024 Filed a Appeal Notice to the Appeals Court 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit Chicago IL. Filled the Notice of Appeal Located at the U.S Eastern District Court of Milwaukee wi and the Clerk of Courts Sent to The Appeals Court 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit of Chicago IL.

Under Questions Presented Invoke Under 28 U.S.C s 1257(a) US Supreme Court Washington D.C Rule 27 Permits Pre- action testimony. Involves Subparagrah (3) (b) RM (c ) back to the defendant with any question(S) that arise though out this Petition... An Gives the Court the right of Passage of Reconstruction Amendments Under the 13<sup>th</sup>,14<sup>th</sup>,15<sup>th</sup>, Authority to Intervene.

## **LIST OF PARTIES**

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**

*Case Pg.*

List of Parties

Rhoda Stahmann

Vs

Christopher Wray

Filled Case

Case 23-cv-1724-bhl U.S Eastern District Milwaukee Wi

Case # 24-1079 U.S Appeals Court Seventh Circuit Chicago IL

Related Cases

PG I

Filing Federal Courts:

Plaintiff-Appellant Rhoda Stahmann – Defendant Christopher Wray  
Case # 24-1079 United States Appeals Court 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit Chicago IL 1-18-24  
App) A.. As follows

On Jan 18<sup>th</sup> 2024 No 24-1079 Notice Sent from the U.S Court of Appeals from the Seventh  
Circuit Notification: No Appellee(s) Served

\*On Jan 18<sup>th</sup> 2024 Notice of Case Opening Sent by the U.S Court of Appeals Seventh Circuit Case  
number 24-1079 Rhoda Stahmann vs Christopher Wray with due date of Docketing Statement  
Due 1-25-2024 and Transcript Information Sheet 2-1-24 Due

\* On Jan 30<sup>th</sup> 2024 Case #24-1079 sent by U.S Court of Appeals for Seventh Circuit Rule 3(b) fee  
Notice Rhoda Stahmann vs Christopher Wray states that the U.S District Court Denied your  
motion to Proceed in Forma Pauperis with the Court of Appeals within the Next thirty days.

\* On Feb 1,2024 Rule to Show Cause Circuit Rule 3(b) Docketing Statement Case# 24-1079 sent  
by the U.S Court of appeals Seventh Circuit it is Ordered the Appellant file this Over due  
Docketing Statement with Clerk within 14 days.

\*On Feb 8<sup>th</sup> 2024 Case# 24-1079 Order Sent by the U.S Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit:  
States that the Appellant filled the Docketing Statement and seeks to file a Petition for a Writ  
Certiorari, she is reminded that any Petition Should be filled with United States Supreme Court  
and in accordance with the Supreme Court Rules, an wait till this Order Seeks Review.

\* On March 11<sup>th</sup> 2024 Order with Case # 24-1079 Rhoda Stahmann vs Christopher Wray with  
Presiding Judge John Z Lee Circuit Court Judge and Doris L. Pryor Circuit Court Judge, Motion for  
Permission to Appeal in Forma Pauperis Filled on Feb 20<sup>th</sup> 2024 by Pro Se Appellant Order  
Denied.

\*On March 25<sup>th</sup> 2024 Case# 24-1079 Rhoda Stahmann vs Christopher Wray Order by the U.S  
Court of Appeals Seventh Circuit Before Presiding Judge John Z. Lee Circuit Judge and Doris L.  
Pryor Circuit Judge, Upon Consideration of Motion Requesting to Proceed without Prepaying  
the filling fee, witch this Court Construes as a Motion Requesting to for reconsideration, filled  
on March 21, 2024 by Pro se Appellant, it is Order that the Motion for reconsideration is  
Denied. Appellant shall pay the required filling Fee. With in 14 days or else this Appeal will be  
Dismissed for Failure to Prosecute Pursuant to Circuit Rule 3(b).

\* On April 17<sup>th</sup> Case# 24-1079 Rhoda Stahmann vs Christopher Wray by the U.S Appeals Court  
Seventh Circuit, this Case Docket on Jan 18<sup>th</sup> 2024 is Dismissed for Failure to Timely Pay the  
Required Docketing Fee. Pursuant to Circuit Rule 3(b).

\* On April 17<sup>th</sup> 2024 Case # 24-1079 Notice of issuance of Mandate From the U.S Court of  
Appeals for the Seventh Circuit Rhoda Stahmann vs Christopher Wray Shows the Herewith is  
the mandate of this Court in this Appeal along with Bill of Cost if any, A Certified Copy of the  
Opinion/order of the Court and Judgement if any direction as to Cost shall Constitute the  
mandate, Type Dismissal status of Record.

Filing Federal Court

Plaintiff- Appellant Rhoda Stahmann Vs Defendant Christopher Wray  
Case# 23-cv-1723 United States District Court Milwaukee WI Dec 26<sup>th</sup> 2023 (App(B) as Follows

Continued- pg 1 Related Cases  
App(B) 23-cv-1724

Motion Filled In Person, Complaint assigned Case # 23-cv-1724 dated Dec 26<sup>th</sup> 2023 Rhoda Stahmann vs Christopher Wray Located at the U.S Eastern District Court Milwaukee WI, Attached with Complaint Document, A signed Consent Form to Proceed before Magistrate Judge, Rhoda Stahmann vs Chris Wray, Signed and Dated By Plaintiff, Both Document The Original Complaint filed 23-cv-1724, Stamped by the Clerk and Filled, An the Document Consent To Proceed with Magistrate Judge, with Box Marked to Proceed before a Magistrated Judge, Singed and dated with the Stamp from the Clerk an Filled.

\*Case # 23-cv-1724 Rhoda Stahmann vs Christopher Wray Document 3-1 filed with Case with letter from the Clerk dated Dec 26<sup>th</sup> 2023 mailed to the Plaintiff with Assigned District Judge Brett Ludwig who Presides in Milwaukee Division of the Court. States that Magistrate Judge was inadvertently Omitted from the Form. Thus Enclosed find the Form with the Magistrate Judges name, Please Complete and Sign and Return Form. Form was Refilled and Sent back to the U.S Eastern District Court of Milwaukee Wi Clerk of Courts.

\* Case # 23-cv-1724-bhl Rhoda Stahmann vs Christopher Wray Date 1-11-24 Pg 1 of 5, Document 5 was Filled at the U.S Eastern District Court Milwaukee WI, an Mailed to the Plaintiff by the Presiding Judge Brett Ludwig, States on Pg. 5 the Order that Stahmann Motion to Proceed with out Payment of the filling fee, ECF No 2 Denied as Moot. Than so Further Ordered that Stahmann Complaint, ECF No 1 is Dismissed with Prejudice as Frivolous. The Clerk Directed to Enter Judgement accordingly. Dated 1-11-24, Document 6 states Judgement in a Civil Action the Action be Dismissed with Prejudice For Frivolousness.

Signed by Clerk Julie D Pg 1 of 1

\* Notice Filled in Person at the U.S Eastern District Milwaukee Wi Case No 23-cv-1724 Notice of Appeal Jan 18<sup>th</sup>,2024, the Plaintiff filled Notice Appeals to the United States Court of Appeals for Seventh Circuit from the Final Judgement Entered in this action on Jan 11<sup>th</sup> 2024. Date Signed Jan 18<sup>th</sup> 2024 Eastern District Wisconsin, Bottom right of Paper Signature Rhoda Stahmann and listed Address PO. Box 391 Poy Sippi Wi 54967 Stamped Located In Upper Right Corner Certified Time Date Of Filling ( Read as Follows ) CLERK USDC EDWI FILLED 2024 18 P 2:50. Plaintiff Rhoda Stahmann vs Christopher Wray with Attachments 3 Pages listed with the Case number of the Lower Court and Signed on Page 3 Rhoda

Stahmann 1-18-24 with Po. Box 391 Poy Sippi WI 54967 Case 23-cv-1724

\* Jan 18<sup>th</sup> 2024 Letter Sent From U.S Eastern District Document 9 Stahmann V Wray. Issued by the Clerk of Courts Gina M Colletti and s/b. Xiong Deputy Clerk with the Letter states case of any Motions to Correct or Modify Supplement or Strike a Pleading from the Recorded must be first filled with the District Court, the Ruling on Motion will become Part of the record and Notice of the Decision will be Sent to the Court of Appeals. The Document 7 that was filled with Courts this Document Is a Copy of the (Notice of Appeal with Case Number 23-cv-1724-bhl states Rhoda Stahmann vs Christopher Wray, this Notice is given that the Plaintiff/Defendant, Plaintiff appeals to the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit from Final Judgement entered in this Action on Jan 11<sup>th</sup>, 2024 dated and Signed this 18<sup>th</sup> day of January,2024 Eastern District of Wisconsin. Stamp Reads in the

Pg 1 Continued Related Cases  
App(B) 23-cv-1724

Upper right-Hand Corner US DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT-WI FILLED 2024 JAN 18 P 2:51 DISTRICT COURT. On Lower Bottom Right Shows Signature Rhoda Stahmann P.o Box 391 Poy sippi WI 54967 filled 1-18-24 then PG 1 of 2 Document 9-1 is Docketing for case that list case number and the Plaintiff v Defendant with dates of fillings and Court Remarks, that list Court only set/Clear flags and when they happened through out the last date 1-18-24 listed the Pro Se Letter re 7 Notice of Appeal (Attachments#1 Docket Sheet (Box)) \*On 1-30-2024 Document 12 Case # 23-cv-1724-bhl Filled at the U.S Eastern District Court Milwaukee Wi Rhoda Stahmann vs Christopher Wray Order Denying Motion to Appeal in Forma Pauperis States the Courts Opinion and Order is Hereby Ordered of the IFP filling that was Submitted under reconsideration it is Hereby Ordered that Stahmanns Motion for Leave to Appeal without Prepayment of Filling Fee,ECF No 8, is DENID. Date at Milwaukee WI Jan 30<sup>th</sup> 2024 Brett H Ludwig.

## Table of Contents

(1-3 Pages)

Questions- Contains 3 Pages, That questions the Violations made through out the Petition, Specifically "Judgement Clause" and Dates OLC Double Jeopardy Memo" that follows the Clause listed that allows the Court to Continue Pursuant of Criminal Conviction without Impeachment, for he "Christopher Wray, is not President and OLC Immunity Memo at \*2(citing of the President and other Civil Officers to Federal Criminal Prosecution while in Office(1973 OLC Memo").....PG.(I)

Table of Contents- This Will Show the Order the Petition is in Followed with the Title of each section of the Petition, Followed with Page Numbers.

This Contains the Order of Filling of the U.S Supreme Court Washington D.C

### Cover Page List of Parties

- Checks the box of all Parties appear in the Caption of the Case on the Cover Page. This Page States "Related Cases" below the "List Parties". In order to follow the Cover Page. The Following Pages attached Present the Cover page Marked Page (I) that states the Parties with the Court, Case number and Court it was filled in. Next is 3 Pages that present the Related cases, with the Court Case filled in order as states with the Court Rule, with filling in Federal Courts with the Plaintiff Rhoda Stahmann vs Christopher Wray, and the Case starting with App..(A) Case 24-1079 U.S Court of Appeals 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit Chicago IL- That Follows App..(B) Case# 23-cv-1724 U.S Eastern District Court Milwaukee Wi....PG (I)

### Index To The Appendices

This List Appendix (A) United states of Appeals Seventh Circuit Chicago IL Case# 24-1079 Reported on 1-18-24 and Dismissed Case on April 17<sup>th</sup> 2024. Appendix (B) United states Eastern District Court, Milwaukee WI Case# 23-cv-1724 Reported on Dec26th 2023 and Dismissed on Jan 11<sup>th</sup> 2024, Appendix (c ) United States Eastern District Court Milwaukee WI Filled Reconsideration on the IFP Filing on 1-18-24, Motion for Appeal without Prepayment of Filing Fee, ECF No 8 Denied 1-10-24, Appendix( E ) filling Petition with The United States Supreme Court Washington D.C and asking the Court to review the Courts Decisions Under invoke Jurisdiction of 28 U.S.C s 1254(1) in Entering a Final Judgement.....PG. (I)

### Table of Authorities Cited

This Contains 3 Pages of Authorities Cited, throughout the Petition, includes the Page number its Located on. This cites the statue or Code or Violation with a Authorities Cited. In the Same Section that Follow the Table of Authorities Cited, you will find "Statues Involved (III) 2 Pgs..... Following will Give You 1 Page marked "Rule" (III) this contains a list of rules throughout the Petition, that were Violations along with PG numbers the Rule states that were violations. Following 2 Pages "Code (III) This will list Codes and Page Numbers that is found throughout the Petition that were violations. Others(III) 3 Pages- This Contains Rules of Procedure and Violations of Code, U.S Constitution, is a Supreme Law of the Land and Where it is Located throughout The (APP). The Whole Petition and other Violations to take into Consideration throughout the Petition Marked (APP....) that gives the U.S Supreme Court well reviewing the Petition to Consider Enforcing it to the Parts of the Petition. Other Authorities(III) 1 Pages (APP..)

Other Authorities- this Contains Other Authorities that list the App(B) or Page Number and where located throughout the Petition.....PG(III)

IN the Supreme Court of the United States Petition For Writ of Certiorari- States Petitioner respectfully Prays that a Writ of Certiorari issue to review Judgement Below. Then states Opinions Below- This contains 2 Pgs. required by the Court filling Marked as one Page for each 2 Pages. This Marks Each Federal Court that the Opinion was reported on and the the Letter Appendix (A) to Represent the U.S Court of Appeals 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit Appeal with Case number and date Reported on 1-18-24-This also shows Appendix (B) as marked reported at the U.S Eastern District Court Milwaukee WI Case # 23-cv-1724 on Dec26th 2023 and dismissed case on 1-18-24-Follows a second Pg. Labeled Pg. 1 Required in filling marks the Box Checked Federal Courts and List the Last Court that decided the case the Higher Level of Courts, that entails the Case number #24-1079 April 17<sup>th</sup> 2024 at the Chicago II Court of Appeals Seventh Circuit., This also states Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C s 1253(1). .....PG (1)

Court Opinions- This Contains 33 Pgs. in Order to follow the Fillings of the Appendix (B) Where the Courts Dismissed the Case In The Court it was Dismissed on April 17<sup>th</sup> 2024 with the U.S Appeals Court Seventh Circuit and all Motions that pertain the Date on the Decision of the Court and date it was Filled on, Then The Courts Opinions on Appendix(A) the U.S Eastern District of Milwaukee WI, it Starts with the Original Complaint that was filled with the Case Number 23-cv-1724-bhl and each Judgement and Filling of motion that is listed with the related cases to Follow order to the Rule of the U.S Supreme Court....(33 Pages of Court Filling and Ruling, Judgement Entered)

Jurisdiction – This Contains a Brief statement provides When Each case was Filled and What Jurisdiction took over what according to each Court and then ask the Court for Jurisdiction to invoke 28 U.S.C 1254(1) for the Finial Ruling of the Petition.....PG(VI)

Constitutional Provisions Involved – Contains The US Constitution Amendment the Letter of Each Amendment and the Context of the Amendment. For each one Listed Contains the Page number and where it can be Located throughout the Petition (this contains 2 pages that list them) .....PG (VII)

Constitutional and Statutory Provisions- This Contains Stat of each Constitution and what Art and U.S Const. it Represents whether it be a Rule and Cites the Authorities that Goes with each one. This will All List the Pg it is Listed on along with the App.... This will show where that meaning is listed in the Petition-This has 3 Pages attached for this section .....PG(VII)

Statement – This Contains a Statement written that tells the Court of why I am Presenting the Petition of aa Writ Cretiria. It Will Start with telling the Court a Introduction to the Statement and what the Defendant Violated along with where Violations Happened and Cause of the Initial Claim Under the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment the Parties along with Equal Protection Right, Duties of the Defendant and and where he failed to Enforce, this include the Statue of the Employee Misconduct 18 U.S.C 242, that he Allowed his employee to Violate the Plaintiff by the 18 U.S.C s

1001 903. Survey of white-Collar Crime 32 AM Crim L Rev 137,323 346(1995) This also With the Threat that raises to National Security and what is at stake, by Illegal use of the Cloud, using the United States Territory and Sectors and Where he failed by Policy in not reporting it, an has Poss. Of the Information Dropped of on Feb20th,2024, and the involvement in not just the state of Wisconsin but Global Companies Being Used along with US Military Intelligence Verint Security. An Certiport. This also contains a intro to where it Lead up to the Fillings an Security Risk that holds over the U.S being District Judge. And People of Higher Authority, along with the falsified Documents that the Eastern District Did under Oath, and Fraud as it cites and states each page and how.....PG 2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15

Argument, This Contains a Argument to the Court On How this issue was Original Addressed That Lead to the Plaintiff , Filling a Complaint before Court Proceedings Started that gave the Defendant the Chance to Correct and enforce law to the Appropriate Legislation along with enforcing Policy and each One, and How the agency Holds the Fraud under Stat 817 Online Sunshine a Organized Fraud and how the Defendant is Guilty Beyond Doubt, and Conspired in the Judicial Statutory Scheme and cites it. An Guilty Beyond Doubt by Document alone that is now held Under the Courts Opinions of Judgement and the Original Document Filled is Guilty of Stat 817.034 1(a)(b) and definition(a)(b)(c)(d)(409a) (D). .....PG 17 (IX)

Reason for Granting the Petition is a Short Paragraph of the Importance and asking the Court for the Relief and to file Under Emergency Due to the severity of the Crime and the Charges that face Pursuant of Federal Prosecution, Thank you for the Courts time in Consideration of the Petition.....Pg 17

Conclusion this Contains The Petition for a Writ of Certiorari should be Granted. Respectfully Submitted With Rhoda Nelsen as Signed signature and Notarized.....PG 18

Index to Appendices

APPENDIX A- United States of Appeals Seventh Circuit Chicago IL Case # 24-1079 report on 1-18-24 Dismissed case on April 17<sup>th</sup> 2024

APPENDIX B- United States District Court U.S Eastern District Milwaukee WI Case # 23-cv-1724 reported on Dec 26<sup>th</sup> 2023. Dismissed on 1-11-24

APPENDIX C- United States Eastern District Milwaukee Wi Filled Reconsideration on IFP motion on 1-18-24 case #23-cv-1724-bhl Dismissed reconsider of Motion for leave to Appeal without Prepayment of filling Fee, ECF No. 8 is Denied. 1-30-24

APPENDIX D- United States Court of Appeals Court Seventh Circuit Chicago IL Case # 24-1079 April 17<sup>th</sup>, 2024 Case Dismissed

APPENDIX E- Filing with The United States Supreme Court Washington D.C on requesting Review of Petition from the Following Courts Listed above that Decided On my case. In each Motion that is Listed with the Related Cases in Order, as Filled. Requesting the Review of the Petition, an invoke Jurisdiction of this Court under 28 U.S.C s 1254(1) In Entering a Finial Judgement Upon Review of the Petition.

## Table of Authorities cited (III)

- U.S 153 statue on Judicial inclusion and exclusion (cites Davidson V. New Orleans, 96 U.S. 104.....PG 9 (App (B) App(A) related cases 23-cv-1724 U.S Eastern District Court Milwaukee Wi,-Case 24-1079 U.S Court of Appeals 7<sup>th</sup> Cir Chicago IL.
- Statutory Interpretation- violation of Civil Rights Law Sec (2). The Equal Protection rights defined in Sec (5) of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment (cites Maltz. Distinguish Professor of Law of Roger University – Camdon. Vest Congress with Authority Adopt Appropriate Legislation to Enforce other Parts of the Amendment (see Sec 5 Constitution Powers and Duties of Congress.....PG. 12 App (B) related cases 23-cv-1724
- Statutory Scheme- (ID citing a statement by Sen Lautenberg (see ID at 435(Robert CJ dissenting and indeed Amplified) Scalia & Garmer, supa Note 5 at XXVII (ID @85) (ID 2 29) .....PG 12 (App (B) related cases 23-cv-1724, U.S Eastern District Court. & Located (App (B).....PG.1 Court Opinions Case 23-cv-1724
- Statutory Interpretation (Chap 3.. Legislative Intent (Socorro Ramirez VS- Hon Court of Appeal and Easter Gardy G.R No.93833 September 25<sup>th</sup> 1995,248 SCRA 590 (Cites true intent) Commissioner of Customs VS- Esso standard Eastern, Inc 66 SCRA 113 (975 Sec 6) .....PG 7,8 12 (App (B) Related cases & Located App (B) Opinions
- Legislative Intent- The rule Causus Omissus Harbendu Est) Clearly Establishes (Cites pp VS Guillermo Manantan No L-14129 july 31,1962, 5 SCRA 684.....PG 13 (App(B) App(A) 23-cv-1724 related Cases, 23-cv-1724 opinions
  - Policy of Courts Subordinate-Rupublic VS-Hon (Cites Eutrupio Migrino& Troadio tecson.....PG 13 (App (B) Case 23-cv-1724 U.S Eastern District Court Milwaukee wi (App (A) 24-1079 U.S Court Appeals Court 7<sup>th</sup> Cir, Chicago IL
  - General Rule on- Buenaseda V-Flaviere Presumption Against Violation of Internarow Law article II Sec 2 Phill Constitution the Rule of Procedure Judicial Decisions, applying Interpreting the Laws of the Constitution shall from Part of the Legal Systems the Phillipiness..... PG 13 (App(B) 23-cv-1724 opinions, related Cases
- 945 Federal Protected Activities, follows U.S Supreme Court under 1983 west-v- atkins 487 U.S 42 49 (1988 Quoting United States Classic 3313 U.S 299 326 (1941) when the wrongdoer is Clothed with Authority of state Law..... PG 13 (App (B) Case 23-cv-1724
- 68 Scalia & Garner, Supra Note 5 at XXVII,69 see ID( Arguing Textualism will discourage Legislative free riding, where by Legal Drafter idly assume that Judges Legal drafter idly assue that will save them from their Blunders) 70 ID(71 ID at 376) (ID at 375 to be government of laws sat and not what the people who drafted the law intended) 73 Katzma NN,Supra note 53 at 10 74(but see ID at 29 ( at times even when statute is Plain on its face, the judge may find #1#2#3#4#5#6.....Pg 13 (App (B)
  - Sec 942 (cites Carpenter, 484 U.S @27(Quoting Mcnally V united state,483 U.S 350,358(1987) Quoting Hammerschmidt V.United States,265 U.S 182,188 1924(the concept of Fraud) the fraudulent Appropriation ID (Quiting grin V shine 187 US 181,189 (1902).....PG 13 .....(App (B)

## Table of Authorities

- Equal Protection Rights (Sec 5 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Cited Maltz. Distguish Professor of Law at Roger University- Camdon. Vest Congress with Authority "Appropriate "Legislation to enforce other Parts of the Amendment Along with Civil Right that follows Civil Right Law Sec 2 Legislation.....Pg. 2 & 4,5,8,12
- False Imprisonment 11.404 deprived the Petitioner. (cites ETT V. Linn-mar..sch Dis 656 N.W 2d IWOW.....PG.2,6
- 13<sup>th</sup>,14<sup>th</sup>,15, Amendment, Supervisory Direction. Torres V. Superintendent of Police Puerto rico Establish Liability state violation Procedural & Substantive Due- Process rights.....PG 3 ( App (B ) related cases 23-cv-1724 U.S Eastern District Court Milwaukee WI
- Deprivation of Civil Rights Cites ( Jennings V, Schumann 567, f 2d 1213, 1219, 20, 3d (Cir 1977).....PG 3 ..App (B ) related Cases 23-cv-1724 U.S Eastern District Court Milwaukee WI
- Stat 948 (Quating United States V Price, 623 f2d 597,591 ( 9<sup>th</sup> Cir 1980) Evidence of Affirmation & Physical Evidence Criminalizes Sec249 Subsection 18 U.S.C s 245 falls under 42 U.S.C s 3631 ( cites McCulloch V. Maryland Art 1 sec 8.....PG 4
- 923. 18 U.S.C c 371 Conspiracy to Defraud the United States Primary to Cheat the Government out of Property or Money.....PG 4
- Sec 102 of the Robert T Stafford Act 42 USC 5122-18 U.S.C.A s 1348 (1)(2)(3) (Cites - Cesnik V. Edgewood Baptist Church, 88 F 3d 802(11<sup>th</sup> Cir 1996).....PG 5
- U.S of Civil Rights Act- Monroe V Pope 365 U.S 1667,173-74 (1961) general Limiting (see 1983 section Supa, Note 1 at 1486-94, Note 3 Supa Provisions) .....PG 5 (App (B) related cases 23-cv-1724 U.S Eastern District Court.
- Title II Cites Sections 10905 Oath of Office Violation of the Oath & Penalty .....PG 7,8,9,10  
**Interpretations**
- Statutory Scheme "Legislative Intent -(Cites Socorro Ramires VS- Hon Court of Appeal and Esther Gardy G.R No 93833 September 25 1995,293 SCRA 590 (Cites true Intent) Commissioner of Customs VS- ESSO Standard Eastern, Inc 66 SCRA 113 (975 sec 6).....PG 7,8,12
  - Legislative Intent, the rule causes-omissus Pro Omissio Harbendu EST) Clearly Establishes(Cites pp VS Guillermo Mallaton No(L-14129 july 31,1962,SCRA 684.....PG 8
  - Policy of the Courts Subordinate Rupblic VS-Hon (Cites Eutro pio mig rino & troadio tecson.....PG 8
  - General rule-Buenaeda V-Flaviere Presumption Against violation of internarrow Law Article II Sec 2 Phil constitution the rule of Procedure Judicial Decisions applying Interpreting the Laws of the Constitution Shall form part of the legal Systems the Phillipiness.....PG 8.
- Interpreting the Laws of the Constitution shall for part of the legal systems Phillipiness (Cites 78 ID, 76 ID at 35 (cites 77 ID @29 Cites Pragmatist..... PG 7

- III themes King V Burwell.....PG 7
- Davidson V. New Orleans,96 U.S 97.86 US 104 104.....PG 9
- U.S Supreme Court West V Atkins 487 U.S 42 & 49 (1988 Quating United States Classic 3319 U.S 299 326 (1941) when the wrong doer is Clothed with Authority of State Law.....PG 13 (App (B) Related Cases 23-cv-1724 U.S Eastern District Court Milwaukee Wi.
- 18 U.S.C s 1001 903. Survey of white-Collar Crime 32 AM Crim L Rev 137.323 346(1995) sec 101 O. Obermairer and 12 morvillo, White Collar Crime Business and regulator offense s 10.02(19900 discussing sec 1001) 1341,1345) Provisions 9-42.010- Coordination of Cha 9-42.001. Cancelling false Documents.....PG 2,3,9,10,12,
- Depriving the U.S of its 1348 Securities and Comedies, under 18 U.S.C 1348 adopted in 202 of Sarbanes-Oxley Act. (Cites United States V Blaszak).....PG 5 (App (B) related cases 23-cv-1724 U.S Eastern District Court
  - Statutory Text (III themes King V Burwell.....PG 7
  - Jennings No 15-1204 OP 14 (Spotting Constitutional issues.....PG 8
- Article II NLRB V NOEL (cites the finding in the text Ambiguous, that allows the Supreme Court Provide relevant" Intra-Session, that Consistent Pattern of Behavior by Congress and the Executive branch, effective by ratifying the Presidents Power as thus Construed NLRB.NOEL canning (2014) .....PG 8

### Statutes Involved (III)

- 18 U.S.C s 1343 under wire Fraud and Alternatives "Defined" Sec 102 (Robert T Stadfford Act 42. U.S.C 5122.....PG 5 (App(B) 23-cv-1724-bhl U.S Eastern District Court Milwaukee Wi
- 18 U.S.C.A s 1343(1)(2)(3).....PG 5 (App (B) 23-cv-1724-bhl U.S Eastern District Court Milwaukee wi
- Failure to Intervene.....PG 6 (App (B) 23-cv-1724-bhl U.S Eastern District Court, Milwaukee wi
- False Imprisonment 11.4040 (Cites ETT V. Linn-Mar..Sch Dis 656 N.W 2d IWOW.....PG 2,6 (App(B) 23-cv-1724-bhl U.S Eastern District Court Milwaukee wi
  - Statutory Interpretation Chap 3 PG. 7,8,12
  - Statutory Scheme "legislate intent ".....PG 8, 12,13
- US 153 Statue Judicial Inclusion and exclusion (Davidson v. New Orleans ,96 US.97 .96 US 104 PG.....9
  - 903.False Statements Concealment.....PG2,3,9,10,12
- Statutory Interpretation "Violation of Civil rights Law Sec (2) The Equal Protection rights Defined in sec 5 the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment.....PG. 12
  - Statutory Scheme .....PG 12
- Stat 948. (Quating United States v Price, 623 f2d 597,591(9<sup>th</sup> cir 1980) Evidence of Affirmation and Physical Evidence Criminalizes Sec 249 subsection 18 U.S.C s 245 falls under U.S.C.s 3631(cites Mcculloch V.Maryland Art 1 sec8.....PG 4
- Deprivation of civil Rights (Jennings V Schumann 567.f 2d 1213,1219,20,3d (cir 1977).....PG 3 App (B)
- 18 U.S.C s 1001 903. Survey of white- Collar 32 AM Crim L Rev 137.323 346(1995 Sec 101 O.Obermairer an 12 morvillo, White Collar Crime Business and regulator offense s 10.02(1990 discussing sec 1001) 1341,1345) Provisions 9-42.010-Coordination of Chap 9-42.001. Cancelling false Documents.....2,3,9,10,12
- Depriving the U.S of its Securities and Comedies, under 18 U.S.C 1348 adopted in 202 of Sarbanes-Oxley Act.(United States V Blaszak).....PG 5 (App(B)
- 945 Federal Protected Activities 1983 west-v-atkins 487 U.S 42 49 (1988 United states Classic 3313 U.S 299 326 (1941).....PG13 App(B)
- U. S 153 statue on judicial inclusion and exclusion (Davidson V .New Orleans,96 US 104)
- Statutory Interpretation violation of civil rights law sec 2 defined sec 5 14<sup>th</sup> amendment (maltz.Distinguish Professor of law of roger university-Camdon.....Pg 7,8,12 App(b)
- Statutory Scheme (ID citing statement by Sen Lautenberg (see ID at 435 (Robert cj dissenting and indeed Amplified) Scalia & Garmer,upa Note 5 at XXVII(ID @85)(ID 2 29).....

- 923. 18 U.S.C s371 Conspiracy to Defraud the united states Primary to cheat the government out of Property or money.....Pg 4 App(b)

Statutes Involved  
(III)

- Statutory Interpretations " Legislative Intent (Socorro VS Ramires VS Hon Court of Appeal and Esther Gardy G.R No 93833 September 25 1995 , 293 SCRA 590 (cites true intent) Commissioner of Customs VS-ESSO Standard Eastern, INC 66 SCRA 113 (075 sec 6) PG 7,8,17, APP..... App(B)
  - Statutory Text (III themes King V Burwell.....PG 7 App..... App(b)
- Stat 948 948 intent to Defraud US or Person (United States V Price 623 f2d 597,591(9<sup>th</sup> Cir 1980) Evidence of Affirmation that Caused Harm to the Plaintiff Under Sec 249 Subsection (a)(2)(B) Criminalizes the act in Subsection (a)(3) of 249( Statue Criminalizes Jurisdictional Element to obtain Conviction. Beyond Doubt.....PG 4 (App....App(B) 23-cv-1724-bhl U.S Eastern District Court Milwaukee Wi.
- Stat 817.034 Online Sunshine 1(A)(B) and definition (a)(B)(c ) (d)(409a(d) Any other Provisions of Law a Criminal Proceeding under this section be Commenced at any time. History- s 7 ch. 87-382.s1 ch 2013-208 see policy 2 Title XLVI Chap817 sec 034

### Statutes Involved (III)

- 18 U.S.C s 1343 under wire Fraud and Alternatives "Defined" Sec 102 (Robert T Stadfford Act 42. U.S.C 5122.....PG 5 (App(B) 23-cv-1724-bhl U.S Eastern District Court Milwaukee Wi
- 18 U.S.C.A s 1343(1)(2)(3).....PG 5 (App (B) 23-cv-1724-bhl U.S Eastern District Court Milwaukee wi
- Failure to Intervene.....PG 6 (App (B) 23-cv-1724-bhl U.S Eastern District Court, Milwaukee wi
- False Imprisonment 11.4040 (Cites ETT V. Linn-Mar..Sch Dis 656 N.W 2d IWOW.....PG 2,6 (App(B) 23-cv-1724-bhl U.S Eastern District Court Milwaukee wi
  - Statutory Interpretation Chap 3 PG. 7,8,12
  - Statutory Scheme "legislate intent ".....PG 8, 12,13
- US 153 Statue Judicial Inclusion and exclusion (Davidson v. New Orleans ,96 US.97 .96 US 104 PG.....9
  - 903.False Statements Concealment.....PG2,3,9,10,12
- Statutory Interpretation "Violation of Civil rights Law Sec (2) The Equal Protection rights Defined in sec 5 the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment.....PG. 12
  - Statutory Scheme .....PG 12
- Stat 948. (Quating United States v Price, 623 f2d 597,591(9<sup>th</sup> cir 1980) Evidence of Affirmation and Physical Evidence Criminalizes Sec 249 subsection 18 U.S.C s 245 falls under U.S.C.s 3631(cites Mcculloch V.Maryland Art 1 sec8.....PG 4
- Deprivation of civil Rights (Jennings V Schumann 567.f 2d 1213,1219,20,3d (cir 1977).....PG 3 App (B)
- 18 U.S.C s 1001 903. Survey of white- Collar 32 AM Crim L Rev 137.323 346(1995 Sec 101 O.Obermairer an 12 morvillo, White Collar Crime Business and regulator offense s 10.02(1990 discussing sec 1001) 1341,1345) Provisions 9-42.010-Coordination of Chap 9-42.001. Cancelling false Documents.....2,3,9,10,12
- Depriving the U.S of its Securities and Comedies, under 18 U.S.C 1348 adopted in 202 of Sarbanes-Oxley Act.(United States V Blaszak).....PG 5 (App(B)
- 945 Federal Protected Activities 1983 west-v-atkins 487 U.S 42 49 (1988 United states Classic 3313 U.S 299 326 (1941).....PG13 App(B)
- U. S 153 statue on judicial inclusion and exclusion (Davidson V .New Orleans,96 US 104)
- Statutory Interpretation violation of civil rights law sec 2 defined sec 5 14<sup>th</sup> amendment (maltz.Distinguish Professor of law of roger university-Camdon.....Pg 7,8,12 App(b)
- Statutory Scheme (ID citing statement by Sen Lautenberg (see ID at 435 (Robert cj dissenting and indeed Amplified) Scalia & Garmer,upa Note 5 at XXVII(ID @85)(ID 2 29).....

- 923. 18 U.S.C s371 Conspiracy to Defraud the united states Primary to cheat the government out of Property or money.....Pg 4 App(b)

Statutes Involved  
(III)

- Statutory Interpretations " Legislative Intent (Socorro VS Ramires VS Hon Court of Appeal and Esther Gardy G.R No 93833 September 25 1995 , 293 SCRA 590 (cites true intent) Commissioner of Customs VS-ESSO Standard Eastern, INC 66 SCRA 113 (075 sec 6) PG 7,8,17, APP..... App(B)
  - Statutory Text (III themes King V Burwell.....PG 7 App..... App(b)
- Stat 948 948 intent to Defraud US or Person (United States V Price 623 f2d 597,591(9<sup>th</sup> Cir 1980) Evidence of Affirmation that Caused Harm to the Plaintiff Under Sec 249 Subsection (a)(2)(B) Criminalizes the act in Subsection (a)(3) of 249( Statue Criminalizes Jurisdictional Element to obtain Conviction. Beyond Doubt.....PG 4 (App....App(B) 23-cv-1724-bhl U.S Eastern District Court Milwaukee Wi.
- Stat 817.034 Online Sunshine 1(A)(B) and definition (a)(B)(c ) (d)(409a(d) Any other Provisions of Law a Criminal Proceeding under this section be Commenced at any time. History- s 7 ch. 87-382.s1 ch 2013-208 see policy 2 Title XLVI Chap817 sec 034

Rule  
(III)

- Violations of Internal Operating Procedure under ( see Fed Appp 47 Fed cir 47(c ) .....PG. 6,7(App (B) 23-cv-1724
- Paragrah 1 & 3 Rule 201 (i) Paragrah (2) Recognizes that discovery may Proceed other than Jurisdictional issues, before the court rules on objecting Party.....PG. 7, 11(App(B) 23-cv-1724
- Failed Policy and Court Rules under amendment Sec 2-301 Paragrah (2) (See Rule 201 General Discovery Provision.....PG. 7(App(B) 23-cv-1724
- Violation of Oath the US Con Article Sec 2 Phill Constitution, General Rule Buenaseda V. Flavier Presumption Against Violation of Internarrow Law Article II Sec Phill, Constitution the Rule Procedure Judicial Decisions Apply Interpreting the Law of the Constitution Shall Form Part of the Legal Systems The Phillipiness.....Pg 7, 8....(App(B) 23-cv-1724
- Legislative Intent- The rule Cause Omissus Pro Omisso Harbende.. Est) (Cites pp VS Guillermo Manatan No L-14129 July 31, 1962, 5 SCRA 684. This Holds Policy of the Court Subordinate Rupblic VS- Hon Cites Etrupio Migrino and troadio tecson .....PG. 7,8,12,13( App(B) 23-cv-1724
- General Rule – Buensseda V. flavier Presumption Against Violation of Internarow Law Article II Sec 2 Phill Constitution Shall for Part of the Legal Systems Phillipiness- cites 78 ID, 76 ID at 35 cite 77 ID @ 29 cites Pragmatist.....PG. \*,12,13 (App (B) 23-cv-1724
- Rule 201 Provisions Article II Rule 201 (B) (4) .....PG 8 (App (B)
  - Rule 607 (B) Reasonable Basis .....App(B)
- Rule 609 Impeachment by Evidence of Conviction of Crime (A General Rule .....PG.14)(App(B) 23-cv-1724
  - Gov Rule 10 Bring Rule 11 Code of Civil Procedure II Allows Sanction Attorneys.....PG. 14 App(B)23-cv-1734
- Rule 201 General Discovery Provisions Under Part E Article II 201 (b) (4) and (c ) (1) & (2)&(3).....PG 14 (App (B) Case 23-cv-1724
- Rule 27 Permits Pre- Action Providing testimony. This Involves Subparagrah (3) Slack (b) RM (c ). This allows any of the People of Higher Authority to Grant Written Briefing back to the Defendant with any Questions that arise throughout this Petition .....PG. 14 (App(B) 23-cv-1724 App(A)24-1079

Code

(III)

- Sec 1983 United states code that holds police government agencies, state officials and other public employees can face legal repercussions when they fail to protect the Constitution.....PG 2,6 (App(B))
- 942.(carpenter,484 U.S @ 27 (quoting McNally v. United States, 483 U.S. 350, 358 (1987) quoting Hammerschmidt v. United States, 265 U.S. 182, 188 (1924) the concept of fraud) the fraudulent Appropriation ID (Quoting Grin v. Shine, 187 U.S. 181, 189 (1902).....Pg 13 (app(B))
- Us. Civil Rights violations under Sec 5-102- entails Deprivation of Rights under "Color of Law" Sec 1983 United States Code (Jennings v. Schumann, 567 F.2d 1213, 1219, 20, 3d (Cir. 1927) Civil rights Protections(1983 Federal Guaranteed right U.S Supreme Court).....PG 2,3 (App(B) 23-cv-1724-bhl U.S Eastern District Court Milwaukee wi .
  - 18 U.S.C. § 241 Misconduct a person Under Oath that's suppose to Uphold the Constitution.....PG 2,4 (App(B) 23-cv-1724-bhl U.S Eastern District Court Milwaukee wi.
- "Supervisory Role Under Sec 2 Legislation Civil Right Law 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment(18 U.S.C. 245 federal Protected Activities.....PG 3,4, (App(B))
- 903. 18 U.S.C. § 1001 False Statement Concealment Survey of White Collar Crime 32AM Crim L REV 137,323-346(1995) Obermairer and Morville, White Collar Crime Business & regulator Offense § 10.02(1990) Discussing Sec 1001) 1341,1343) Provisions 9-42.010- Coordination of Chap 9-42.001.....PG 2,3,9,10,12
- 18 US Code 1343 (42 U.S.C. 5122 Fraud by wire .....PG 4 App(B) 23-cv-1724-bhl U.S Eastern District Court Milwaukee wi.
  - 18 US Code 1348.....PG 4,5
- 18 USC 1342 Fraud & swindles, 1348 securities and Comedies fraud, 1343 fraud by wire (42 U.S.C. 5122 affects financial Institution..... PG 4 (App(B) 23-cv-1724-bhl U.S Eastern District Court, Milwaukee wi
- 18 U.S.C. 242stat 948 intent Defraud US or Person (United States v. Price, 623 F.2d 597, 591 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1980), evidence of affirmation that Caused Harm to the Plaintiff under Sec 249 Subsection (a)(2)(b) criminalizes the act in Subsection (a)(3) of 249(statute Criminalizes 18 U.S.C. § 245 this falls Under 42 U.S.C. § 3631(Cites McCulloch v. Maryland) Art 1 Sec 8 Jurisdictional element to obtain Conviction Beyond Doubt under Supervisory "Duties and role to uphold the Oath and Constitution 18 U.S.C. ....PG 4 (App(B) 23-cv-1724-bhl U.S Eastern District Court Milwaukee wi.
- Stat 923 18 U.S.C. 371 Conspiracy to defraud US or Person or Cheat the Government out of Money or Property.....PG 4 (App(B) 23-cv-1724-bhl U.S Eastern District Court Milwaukee Wi.
  - Depriving the U.S. of its 1348 Securities & Comedies Under 18 U.S.C. 1348 adopted in 2002 of Sarbanes-Oxley Act.....PG 5 (App(B) 23-cv-1724-bhl U.S Eastern District Court Milwaukee wi.
  - 18 U.S.C. 1348 (United States v. Blaszczak).....PG 5 (App (B) 23-cv-1724-bhl U.S Eastern District Court Milwaukee wi

- 18 U.S.C s 1343 under wire Fraud and Alternatives these are defined under sec 102 Robert T Stafford Act 42 U.S.C 5122 affects financial Institution under 18 U.S.C.A s 1343(1)(2)(3)- Cesnik V. Edgewood Baptist Church,88 F 3d 902 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir 1996) .....Pg.5 (App(B) 23-cv-1724-bhl U.S Eastern District Court Milwaukee Wi
- US 148 state rights Guaranteed by the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment, Under Civil Rights Act 1866) Sec 2 empower to enforce sec1 as Famous words of (Mcculloch V Maryland ) and 1819 decision Article VI Debt, Supremacy, Oaths religious test & Art V a 4<sup>th</sup> Clause in the 9<sup>th</sup> Section of 1<sup>st</sup> Art an that no state without its Consent Shall deprive of its Equal Suffrage in the Senate.....PG 5 (App (B) 23-cv-1724-bhl U.S Eastern District Court Milwaukee wi
- Defendant Failed to Enforce 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Under 18 U.S.C 242 Failure to uphold Sec1983 United Code.....PG 6 (App(B) 23-cv-1724-bhl U.S Eastern District Court Milwaukee Wi.
- 18 U.S.C Sec 245 Federal Protected Activities .....PG 8,13 (App(B) 23-cv-1724-bhl U.S Eastern District Court Milwaukee. WI
- US. Supreme Court Under 1983 West V Atkin 487 US 42 49 (1988 quoting United States Classic 3313 US 299 326(1941) When the Wrongdoer is Clothed With Authority of State Law.....PG 13 (App(B) 23-cv-1724-bhl U.S Eastern District Court Milwaukee WI

Code (111)

## Others

### (III)

- 28 U.S.C 636c Fed rule Procedure 73(b) clarify discrepancies Filling (App(B)23-cv-1724 (App(A)24-1079 (A questions presented.
- Violation judicial Scheme Special Provisions(B) Sec 8315(Cross res sec 5525-5529) (App(B) 23-cv-1724(App(A) 24-1079 Court Questions Presented
- Violation Federalist 78 Presented Document filled with violation of Statutory Interpretation, Pragmatism, 78 federalist, 80 Pragmatist (see Sec2-301 code Civil Procedure (735 ILCS 512-301(West 1998). (App (B) 23-cv-1724 Court Questions Presented
- Violation civil right Act 6ID & 7ID Characterization of the extent of official Immunity was not Uncontroversial. (App(B) 23-cv-1724 (App (A) 24-1724
- Violation of Statutory Scheme under(Issues State) Sec 1983 Under US 149 11) 20 US 150, US 149 s 20 11 Georgia law, US 148 state rights guaranteed by the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment for Purpose of Federal Jurisdiction, the doctrine history(barney v city of New York 193 US 430 with Raymond V Chicago traction Co(Supra:Memphis U Cumberland telephone co218 U.S 624 with home & Tel CO. Los Angeles,227 U.S 278 Barney V. City of New York, Supra which ruled otherwise although Question has never been Over ruled. (App(B) 23-cv-1724 App(A) 24-1079 Court questions Presented
- Violations 18 U.S.C 242 Deprivation of Life (App(B)23-cv-1724 (App(A) 24-1079 Questions Presented
- Violation Equal Rights Protections (App(B) 23-cv-1724 (App 24-1079) Questions Presented
- US Constitution is a Supreme Law of the Land< No Federal Law (Statue) Enacted by the U.S Congress Must be Followed by every state in the Country is one of the requirements by Code of Ethic & Provisions, that the FBI Director Violated working for the U.S (App(B) 23-cv-1724 (App(A) 24-1079 Questions Presented.
- Violation Under 18 U.S.C 245(a) failed to uphold this Provisions of Law (Fact Beyond Importance. (App(B) 23-cv-1724 (App(A) 24-1079 Questions Presented
- Violation 18 U.S.C 245 Federal Protected Activities (A)(1) following Impeachment Rule 607(B) (App(B) 23-cv-1724 (App(A) 24-1079 Question Presented

- Violation 201 General Rule Art II Rule 201(b)(4) (App(B)23-cv-1724 (App(A) 24-1079 Questions Presented
  - (A) General Rule 609 Evidence of Conviction of a Crime (Doc 5) Clear Evidence a US Crime Committed Statutory Scheme Legislative Text (Socorro Ramires VS Hon Court of appeal & Esther Gardy G.R No93833 September 25,1995, 293 SCRA 590(Cites true Intent) Commissioner of Customs VS- ESSSO Standard Ester,IC 66 SCRA 113 (975 Sec6) (App(B) 23-cv-1724 (App(A) 24-1079 Questions Presented
    -
- Violation 18 U.S.C Sec 1594(b) & (C ) Conspiracy (Extra Territorial Jurisdiction. (App(B) 23-cv-1724 (App(A) 24-1079 Questions Presented
  -
- Violation 18 U.S.C 241 Provision Conspiracy Against Rights Criminal Civil rights Statue (App (B )23-cv-1724 (App(A) 24-1079 Quested Presented
  -
- Violations US Civil Protections Act (App(B) 23-cv-1724 (App(A) 24-1079 Questions Presented
  -
- Violations U.S Civil Right Act (Civil Liberties Sec 2 Policy Sec 1361 18 U.S.C (App(B) 23-cv-1724 (App(A) 24-1079 Questions Presented
  -
- Failure to Intervene- (Federal Statute) (App (B) 23-cv-1724 (App(A) 24-1079 Questions Presented
  -
- Failure to Intervene under the 13<sup>th</sup>,14<sup>th</sup>,15<sup>th</sup> Amendment passage of reconstruction amendments that gave the Court Authority to intervene (Torres V superintendent of police Puerto Rico Establish liability, this doctrine that follows the court. This clearly state (see sec 42 & 47 of civil right Act 6ID & 7ID at 58) this gave Characterization of the extent of official immunity was not Uncontroversial. (Note Affect a outcome of a Discretion filled caused judicial scheme under Special Provisions(B) Section 8315(cross ref sec 5525-5529) (App(B) 23-cv-1724, (App (A) 24-1079 Quested Presented
  -
- Violation of Federal Protected Rights (App(B) 23-cv-1724 (App(A) Questions Presented.
  -
- Violation of Protecting Human Rights Law by Policy (App(B) 23-cv-1724 (App(A) 24-1079 Questions Presented
  -

Questions to US 151 s 20 (App(B) 23-cv-1724 (App(A) 24-1079 quested presented

-

- Internal operating Procedures (see Fed R App 47 Fed cir R 47(c) (App (B) 23-cv-1724 (App(A) 24-1079 Questions Presented
  -
- US 153 Judicial inclusion and exclusion (Davidson V New Orleans,96 U.S 97 96 U.S 104 (App(B) 23-cv-1724 (App(A) 24-1079 Questions Presented
  -

- Statutory scheme legislative text (scalia &Garner. Supa note at XXVII (App (B) 23-cv-1724 (App(A) 24-1079 Questions Presented

- 18 U.S.C 241 (1) Deprivation of Rights Privileges or immunities secured or Protected by the Federal Constitution. App(B) 23-cv-1724 App(A) 24-1079 Questions Presented

These are all Violations That Support in the Questions In the Case (Petitioner-) (Rhoda Stahmann Vs (Respondent)Christopher Wray, (note Name filled to match the Petition Filled in the Courts at time of filling, Legal Name Change Rhoda (stahmann) Nelsen. These are Questions that follow Rules, Statues, Provisions, Civil Right Law, Civil Protection Law, Along with Authorities Cited to Support the question, US Code, US Code of Ethics and Policy, they include Court Rules that are in Question, that Supports the Supreme Court Law of the Land. This Is where it allows the Court Under the two Cases of Case # 23-cv-1724 Filled(reported) in the U.S Eastern District Court on Dec26th 2023, & Case # 24-1079 Filled On 1-18-24 with the Court of Appeals seventh Circuit Court Chicago IL, Then Dismissed On April 17<sup>th</sup> 2024. The Jurisdiction of this Court in invoked under 28 U.S.C s 1254 (1) This Include (Rule 27 Permits Pre- Action Providing testimony. This Involves Subparagrah (3) Slack (b) RM (c ) back to the defendant with any questions that arise throughout this Petition... An gives the Court the Right of Passage of Reconstruction Amendments under the 13<sup>th</sup>,14<sup>th</sup>,15, Authority to intervene.

## Other Authorities

PG (111)

\*\*Under 18 USC sec 242 the elements to be satisfied are listed in argument and is the courts opinions that follows the motion (s) of related cases in order. This is filled official court document. In the U.S Eastern District with "Internal operating Procedures under (see fed rule app 47, fed cir R 47(c )

\*\*\*\*#1 18 USC sec 242(1) willfully subjecting any person to the deprivation of rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the federal constitution or laws "Establish motion "Complaint "case # 23-cv-1724 filled dec 26<sup>th</sup> 2023, follows ruling on 1-11-24 document 5 courts ruling "by Analysis" judge state insufficient to support a federal lawsuit. Under law if a individual under supervisory role acting as a individual, was given notice, is allowed to sue under sec 1983 under federal violation. Also falls under rule 609, As complaint states the individual "Christopher Wray" Supervisor of FBI agency was given a Complaint that Specifically stated under 18 USC 242 deprivation, that his acting Agent of "color of law Division, violated the Plaintiff and Agency on March 30<sup>th</sup> 2023 was given a Complaint that stated JUST THAT! As it states (see related cases -see motion filled Dec 26<sup>th</sup> 2023 U.S Eastern District "Secured and Protected by Federal Constitution or Laws. See Doc 5 Dismissed case, and willfully deprived the plaintiff of her rights, that are clearly stated in filling motion. (see pg 3 of motion filled dec 26<sup>th</sup> 2023 "clearly cites Parties Involved, "Name of Division-color of law " Duties as a "state of color" Unconstitutional Act under Supervisory Role, As acting Director Christopher Wray, STATES "Equal protection Laws' An states (see pg 4 motion Complaint " Unconstitutional Act of An official will be at least be a violation of oath of official "Wray's JOB DUTIES" of his office. An states the Authorities cited TORRES V SUPERINTENDENT of police Puerto rico Estblish Liability.

"State Violation of procedural or substantive Due-Process Rights"

"Element Plaintiff was under Due- Process and federal Agency "After knowing federal law was Broke Failed to intervene and uphold the US Constitution and violated the 13<sup>th</sup>,14<sup>th</sup>, 15<sup>th</sup> Amendment, the deprived the plaintiff of 18 U.S.C 242 of life under false imprisonment, under (circit 1977) violates a persons civil and constitution right) Jennings v shumann 567 f2d 1213,1219 20 3d.

An Allowed criminal Acts to proceed that Clearly Violated "state and federal Law. An under failure is right for relief under federal violation. "there for 2 elements satisfied #3 who's rights deprived must have been present in any state, territory, or District within the US.#4 Person must of acted willfully to deprive the other person(s) of his or her rights.

An 18U.S.C s 242 Applies against all acts by state agents "Individuals under Due- process such as ones violating the "Plaintiff

"A Private individuals acting in consort with federal officers are entitled to the Protection Provided by 18U.S.C s 242

\*\*\*\*this falls under Provisions against Acts Under Color of Law (18 USC s 242 .....App(B ) related cases 23-cv-1724

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 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court Appeals (Chicago IL) Case # 24-1079 on 1-18-24; 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 B to the petition and is

reported at U.S. Eastern District Milwaukee WI Case # 23-cv-1724 on Dec 26<sup>th</sup> 2023; or,  
[ ] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,  
[ ] is unpublished. and dismissed on 1-11-24

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

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits 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 \_\_\_\_\_ court appears at Appendix \_\_\_\_\_ 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 Case# 24-1079 April 17<sup>th</sup> 2024 Chicago IL Court of Appeals Seventh Circuit Chicago IL.

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).

## VI Jurisdiction

On Dec 26<sup>th</sup> 2023, Case # 23-cv-1724 there was a Filled Complaint with the U.S Eastern District Courts Milwaukee wi, On Jan 11<sup>th</sup> 2023, the U.S Eastern District Made a Ruling of a Final Judgement of a IFP and Complaint under the Jurisdiction of 1915 and 1915(a) The Judgement was Ruled as Moot on the IFP Complaint by the Judge Brett Ludwig, and on the Complaint was ruled as Frivolous.

On Jan 18<sup>th</sup> 2024 a Notice of Appeal was filled at the U.S Eastern District Court, jurisdiction 1915 of the case 23-cv-1724 to the U.S Appeals Court 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit Chicago IL Jurisdiction of 1915 (a)(1) . On Jan 18<sup>th</sup> the U.S Court of Appeals 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit Chicago IL, opened the case, with case number 24-1079, On April 17<sup>th</sup> 2024 the U.S Appeals Court 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit Chicago IL, made a Final Judgement on the Case # 24-1079

Dismissed, For Failure to timely pay the required Docketing fee, Pursuant to Circuit Rule 3(b) Type of Dismissal Status record- No record to be returned. In This Petition for a Writ Certiorari, asking the Courts to seek review on the Federal Case that was reported on Dec 26<sup>th</sup> 2023 23-cv-1724 and The Federal Case Reported at the U.S Court of Appeals 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit Chicago IL Case 24-1079, An Dismissed April 17<sup>th</sup> 2024. It raises a Great Fact Beyond Importance of not just where the Courts Erred, On a Judicial Decision, but the Outcome that Caused Nation Security Issues of the Statutory Scheme Done, as Clear Evidence Shows in the App(B) filling by a U.S District Judge Brett Ludwig 23-cv-1724-bhl and is a filled Document(5) that He filled in a federal Court Building, That Violated the U.S Supreme Court Law and after Reviewing all the Documents, I am Petitioning to The U.S Supreme Court to invoke Jurisdiction Under 28 U.S.C s 1254(1) Under Emergency Filling Due to the Importance of the People of Higher Authority Runs a Greater Risk of Federal case's being Compromised, this run a Fact of Importance due to these Individuals The U.S Relies on to Protect the U.S and be Lawful in the U.S Eastern District Courts of Milwaukee wi Wisconsin, of state and the Background of the Petition. An give Testimony to the US Supreme Courts and relied on relaying Security Threats to the U.S as you review the Case you will clearly at face see the Person that beholds Direction for the U.S is not Protecting, the Court System, Person, and Employees of all agencies to be able to properly protect thee U.S being the US Territory and Sectors Upon Global Companies Under Cyber and Identity Theft, and Illegal use of the Cloud to gain Access to a Persons Life Illegally. That Targeted one the Plaintiff and among other Person(s) of the U.S. Now asking Upon receiving this Petition the Courts Grant the Jurisdiction to review this Petition and Importance of it.

Jurisdiction to invoke under 28 U.S.C. 1254(1)

28

**Constitutional Provisions Involved  
(VII)**

(That is Violation on the Petition)

**1. United States Constitution Amendment XIV**

All Persons Born or Naturalized in the United States and Subject to the Jurisdiction there of are Citizens of the United States and of the State where in Privileges of Immunities of Citizens of the United States nor shall any state deprive any Person of Life Liberty or Property, with out due Process of Law nor deny to any Persons within its Jurisdiction the equal Protection of the laws. (App (B)

**2. United States Constitution Amendment V**

No Person Shall be held to answer for Capital, or otherwise infamous Crime unless on a Preseutment or indictment of a Grand jury, except in cases arising land or naval force, or in the militia when in actual service in time of war or Public danger, nor shall any person be subject for the same offenses to be put twice in jeopardy of life, or limb : nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor deprived of life liberty, or property, with out due process of law, nor shall property be taken for public use, without just Compensation. (App (B)

**3 United states Constitution amendment X**

14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Due Process Law, Nor shall any state deprive any Person of Life, Liberty or Property with out Due Process Law.....PG 4 (App (B)

**4) United states Constitution Amendment XIV S 1 Equal Protection Rights.....Pg 4 (App (B)**

**5) (9-42.010)- Coordination of Chap 9 42.0001.....Pg 3 (App (B)**

**6) Art 1 sec 8.....Pg. 4 App(B)**

**7) US Civil Right act- Monroe V. pope 365 U.S 1667,173 74 (1961) (See 1983 Section Supa Note 1 at 1486-94 Note 3 Supa Provisions.....Pg. 5 (App(B)**

**8) Amendment XIV Sec 5 provision article Sec 1 Equal protections right 14<sup>th</sup> amendment.....PG 5 (App(B)**

9) 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment under 16 U.S.C 242, which holds a important "Clause under "Provisions" Equally Provisions was statement that "Nor Shall any state deprive any person(s) of life Liberty, or Property with out Due Process of Law, nor deny to any person within Jurisdiction, the Equal Protection of the Laws. The right to Due Process of Law and Equal Protection of the Law now applied to both Federal and State Governments, became Part of the Supreme Law of Land First section, 14<sup>th</sup> amendment also nationalize the Bill of Rights by making it Binding Upon States Amendment XIV Section 1- Sec 5 and Sec 5 "Congress shall have Power to enforce by Appropriate Legislation, the Provision of this Article. ....Pg 6..... (App (B) App (A)

10) Failed Policy and Court Rules Under Amendment Sec-301 Paragraph (2) (see rule 201 General Discovery Provision) .....PG 6.....(App (B)

11) Article VI Paragraph (2) US Constitution "Clause" "Provisions Oaks spoke US Constitution contains least 5 divinely insured Principles 14<sup>th</sup> amendment "Clause #3 article VI Oaths.....PG 8 (App (B)

12) Article VI Supreme Law Clause (1) Clause (2).....PG 8 (App(B)

13) Art VI c2.1.....PG 8 (App(B)

14) Art VI.C2.....PG 8 (App(B)

15) Art VI C2.2.1.....PG 8 (App(B)

16) Art VI C2.2.2.....PG 8 (App(B)

17) Art VI C2.2.3.....PG 8 (App(B)

18) Art VI C2.3.....PG.8 (App(B)

19)Art VI C2.3.1.....PG.8 (App(B)

20) Art VI C2.3.3.....PG. 8 (App(B)

21) Art VI C2.3.4.....PG 8 (App (B)

22) Clause 3 Oath of Office Art VI C3.1..... PG. 8 (App(B)

23) Art VI C3.2.....PG. 8 (App(B)

24) Art VI C3.2.1 .....PG 8 (App (B)

25) Art C3.2.2 .....PG 8 (App(B)

26) General Rule Provision under Part E Article II 201 (b)(4) (c )

(1) & (2) (3) be enforced in this case, also Rule 27 Permits Pre – Action Providing testimony. Subparagraph (3) Slack (B) RM (c ) This can Follow with anyone of the people of Higher Authority to Grant Written Briefing back to the Defendant with any questions that arise through out this Petition. ....PG 14..... (App (B)

27) Statutory Scheme (ID citing a statement by Sen Lautenberg (Se ID @ 435 (Robert CJ dissenting and.Indeed Amplified) Scalia & Garmer, Supa Note 5 at XXVII (ID 2 29) .....PG 12..... (App (B)

• Title XLV Chap 817 Sec 034 - Statute 817.034

Online Sunshine 1 LA) (B) Definition (a)(b)(c) (d 409 a(d) Any other provisions of Law a Criminal proceeding under this section be commenced at any time History- s 7 ch. 87-382 ,s 1 ch 2013-208 Sec Policy 2

## Constitutional and Statutory Provisions

### (VII)

- 1) U.S Con Article II Sec 2 Phillip Construction General Rule ( Buenaseda V. Flavier, Presumption. Against Violation of Internarow Law Article II Sec 2 Phillip Constitution the Rule of Procedure Judicial Decisions apply Interpreting the Laws of the Legal Systems the Phillipiness..... Pg. 4 (App (B) related cases # 23-cv-1724 Dec 26<sup>th</sup> 2023, U.S Eastern District Court Milwaukee WI.
- 2) Statutory Interpretation (A) textualism Constrains Judicial Discretion, the tendency of the Judges to Imbue Authoritive text with their own Policy preferences, (B) Intentionalism (c ) Paragmation Judges should take a Real world consequences and Social understanding into a Court when Interpreting an Ambigous "Statutory Provisions" This follows a Spacific Document (5) that follows the violation of this Constitution and statutory Scheme Legislative Text. This Specifies the Document under Jennings no 15-1204 OP 14(Spotting Constitutional issues,that does not give the court authority to rewrite the statute as it Pleases. Instead Cannon Permits a Court to Choose between Competing Plausible Interpretations of statutory text(citations Omitted) under title 18 U.S.C sec 245 federal Protected Activities, The Document #5 filled on 1-11-24, "Statutory Interpretations Chap 3 ..Legislative Intent- Socorro Ramirez VS- Hon G.R No.93833 September 25.1995.248 SCRA 590(Cites true intent Commissioner of Customs VS- Esso Standard Eastern, Inc 66 SCRA 113(975 Sec 6..Follows Legislative Intent, the Rule Causes-Omissus Pro Omissio Harbendu Est) Clearly Establishes (cites pp VS Guillermo Mallaton No(L 14129 July 31,1962,5 SCRA 684..Policy of the Courts Subordinate Rupblic VS-Hon (cites Eutro pio mig rino & troadio tecson, General Rule- Buenaeda V- Flaviere Presumption Against Violation of internarow Law Art II sec 2 Phillip constitution the Rule of Procedure Judicial Decisions applying Interpreting the Laws of the Constitution Shall form Part of the Legal Systems the Phillipiness. .... PG. 8 (App (B) Case #23-cv-1724 U.S Eastern District Court Milwaukee Wi
- 3) Statutory Interpretation (A ) textualism Constrains Judicial Discretion, the tendency of the Judges to Imbue Authoritive text with their own Policy Preferences (B) Intentionalism (C ) Paragmation Judges should take a real world Consequences and Social understanding into a Court when Interpreting an Ambigous. "Statutory Provisions" Chap 3 Statutory Scheme "Legislative Intent -Soccrro Ramirez VS-Hon Court of Appeal and Easther Gardy G.R No 93833 September 25 1995,298 SCRA 590(cites true intent (Commissioner of Customs Vs-ESSO Standard Eastern, Inc 66 SCRA 113 (975 Sec 6... Doc 5 filled 1-11-25 case # 23-cv-1724-bhl Violation of Oath written with Legislative Intent -the rule Causes Omissus Pro Omissio Harbende. Est)

Clearly Establish (cites pp VS. Guillermo Manatan NO L-14129 July 31, 1962, 5 SCRA 684, Holds Policy of Court Subordinate-Rublic Hon Cites Eutrupio Migrino and Troadio tecson. Given rule -Buenaseda V-Flaviere Presumption Against Violation of internarow Law Art II Sec 2 Phill Constitution the rule of procedure judicial Decisions Applying "Interpreting the Laws of the Constitution shall for Part of the Legal Systems Phillipiness- cite 78ID, 76ID at 35 cite 77ID @ 29 Cites Pragmatist .....PG 7 (App (B)

4) Interpreting Laws- under Jennings NO 15-1204 Slip OP 14(Spotting Constitutional Issues does not give the Court Authority to rewrite a statue as it Pleases, Instead Canon Permits a Court to Chose between Competing Plausible Interpretations of Statutory text (Citations Omitted) Ruling Harmful Presumptions Textualists Under III theme King V Burwell. PG 7 (App(B) 23-cv-1724 U.S Eastern District Court Milwaukee Wi.

5) 18 U.S.C s 1001 903. Survey of White Collar Crime 32 AM Crim L Rev 137,323,346(1995) Sec 1001 O.Obermairer and 12 morville, White Collar Crime, Buisiness and regulator offense s 10.02 ( 19900 discussing sec 1001) 1341,1343) Provisions 9-42.001 Cancealing False Documents. .....PG 2,9,10,12 (App(B) #23-cv-1724 U.S Eastern District Court Milwaukee Wi.

6) Sec 2 Legislation Civil Rights Law 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment (18 U.S.C 245 Federal Protected Activities (Provisions).....PG 3, 8,...(App(B) 23-cv-1724 U.S Eastern District Court Milwaukee Wi.

7) Protection Sec 2" Appropriate Legislation "U.S Supreme Court Federal laws Passed Pursuant to this Provision "Failure to Intervene (statue).....PG.3 (App (B) 23-cv-1724 U.S Eastern District Court Milwaukee Wi

8) U.S Amend X 15<sup>th</sup> Amendment Due Process Clause "Importance "Clause nor Shall any state deprive any Person of Life, liberty or Property without Due Process Law. U. S Const Amend XIV s 1v.....PG 5 (App(B) 23-cv-1724 U.S Eastern District Court Milwaukee wi

9) Jennings- No -1204 Slip Op 14 (Spotting Constitutional issues does not give the Court Authority to rewrite a statue as it Pleases. Instead Canon Permits a Court to Choose Competing Plausible Interpretations of Statutory text (Citations Omitted) by citing behind Each Judges Ruling Harmful Presumptions textulist under II themes King V-Burwell

10)Statutory Scheme “Legislative Text” Article II NLRB V. NOEL finding in text Construed NLRB. NOEL Canning (2014) .....PG 8 (App (B) 23-cv-1724 U.S Eastern District Court, Milwaukee Wi.

11) Failure to Uphold the U.S Constitution & Supreme Law of Land. No Federal or State Law (Statues) Enacted by the U.S Congress Must be followed by every state in the country. (3) Constitutional Provisions federalism aside, three key Principles are the Crux of the Constitution Separations of Powers, Checks & Balances & Bicameralism..... PG 8 (App (B) 23-cv-1724 U.S Eastern District Court Milwaukee Wi

12) 68 Scalia & Garner,Supa note 5 @ XXVII,69 see ID) Argueing textualism (70) ID 2 376) ID @ 375 to be government of Laws(73 Katzma NN,Supra Note 53 @ 10 74(but see ID @29: at times when the statute is Plain on its face the judge may find #1#2#3#4#5#6....PG 13 (App(B) 23-cv-1724 U.S Eastern District Court Milwaukee Wi

**Statement**  
**(Introduction of statement)**

I am presenting to the U.S supreme Court a writ Cretiraia , that involves the Original statement that was filled in the U.S Eastern District Milwaukee wi, Case #23-cv-1724, on Dec26th 2023.

This Will show the Cause of the initial claim and Under the U.S Constitution the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment, the Parties include Rhoda Stahmann Vs- Christopher Wray. This involves how he violated his Duties of office, and violated the Plaintiff Rhoda stahmanns Equal Protection Right, sec 5 14<sup>th</sup> amendment <maltz. Distguish Professor of Law at roger University – Camdon. Vest Congress with Authority “Appropriate” Legislation to enforce other Part of the Amendments Sec 5 Constitution Powers and duties off Congress. Along with Civil Right, that follows Civil right Law, Sec 2 Legislation. This entitles the cause of Wrongfully Accusing a Person(s) that ended in his negligence an failure of his title, an ended up being held under “false Imprisonment. Under

11.404 that deprived the Petitioner of, ETT V. Linn-mar..sch. Dis 656 N.W 2d Iwow.

Furthermore, the act of allowing Misconduct done, by an Important part of his Agency under 18 U.S.C s 242 misconduct. This is a Person of Oath that is supposed to enforce Civil rights and hold a individual(S) accountable for their actions. Most important fact of the Agent Chris allowed the Officials to Commit 18 U.S.C s 1001 903. Survey of white Collar crime 32 AM Crim L Rev 137,323 346(1995) sec 101 O. obermairer and 12 morvillo, white collar Crime Business and regulator offense s 10.02(19900 discussing sec 1001) 1341,1343) Provisions 9-42.010- coordination of Cha 9-42.001. Cancelling false documents and allowed his agent of acting of State of color, “Collar of Law commit the Violation of his office. Furthermore, will go in depth of the Fact beyond Importance of the case, that violates the US Supreme Court Law of the Land.

This Will Express to the Court in Order Of how I the Petitioner brought this individual forward,

In the Court to seek Justice.

The Defendant Christopher Wray holds a High Authority, for the United states His Role as a “Director” is to give Authority and Direction when Employees of his Agencies Violate the oath, or Unlawful acts. Along with making Important Decisions when a Threat to Nation Security is at stake.

This is one of the Fact beyond Importance that has involved in this Case. The Fact Is that Christopher Wray was, notified of a employees Misconduct, and Negligence, and violation of the Oath, to stay in office at the FBI Agency, that allowed Law enforcement Misconduct, and Fraud, and Scheme. That Violated a person of their U.S Civil rights Violations under Sec 5 -102. This also, entails Deprivation of rights under “Color of Law” Under Section 1983 United States

Code that holds Police and government agencies, state officials an other Public employees can face legal repercussions when they fail to Protect the Constitution. This holds his Knowledge of the Crime Committed that ended up so Ambiguous Under “Statutory Interpretation “That Lead to him Conspiring in the “Statutory Interpretation” Under Legislative text with a U.S Eastran District Judge, Brett Ludwig on the date of 1-11-14. Under the Petition the where Law has been Broken and raises Nation Security Issues, and under Judicial Discretion, for the Fact it involves a U.S District Judge to also Violate the Plaintiff by the Statutory Interpretation” an Statutory scheme under Legislative text and Continue to violates his Duties after Knowing the “US District Judge

did so by Further Being received papers of the Initial Complaint from the Plaintiff 3 times and has plenty of time to Enforce his Duties of office and Raises the Importance beyond Fact, that he is not Capable of holding his duties of office for the US. As you Read Further into the Petition of statement. These Violations by Law have gone so far to be Ambiguous, and up most, where The US Supreme Courts are allowed to intervene in holding him accountable for these actions, that does not need to wait the Impeachment Process. This involvement in the Fraud and scheme and his Role and Failure to Report the Nation securities to Office, as is a Big role when it affects Defrauding the United states, and its securities and Territory and sectors that evolve around the United states that would Send threats out to put the Life's of everyone in the U.S including the Supreme Courts Judges and Court life's, and Each Person(s) in the United states and would like the supreme court to Consider the extra territorial Jurisdiction . This Introduction to the Court Will Continue Now in statement.

## Statement

On March 30<sup>th</sup> 2023, Christopher Wray Violated, his duties of office under His Roles and Duties, of a supervisory role under Sec2 Legislation Civil Rights Law 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment(18 U.S.C 245 Fedeeral Protected Activities. This was a Knowinly act on his Own behalf on a submitted Complaint to the FBI Agency.

This ended up Violating the "Plaintiff" Rhoda Stahmann 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment under Equal Protection Sec 2 Ampower Congress " Enforce" the Ban on slavery & Involuntary Servitude by "Apprriate Legislation" Accourding to the US supreme Court, federal Laws Passed Pursuant to this Provision," Can address a Broader Range of Discrimintory Conduct than conced bar to enforce the Van on Slavery an Involuntary Servitude. The Outcome of his Failure to Uphold the Federal Laws, ended in the "plaintiffs" Wrongfully Imprisoned, for failure to intervene. As a person Actiing of Authority that could of Prevented the "false Imprisonment" 11.404 ETT V. Linn-Mar..sch Dis 656 N.W 2d IWOW 2002. An Violate her 13<sup>th</sup>,14<sup>th</sup>, 15<sup>th</sup>, Amendment by under his supervisory Direction, of his "Color of Law Division""Torres V Superintendent of Police Puerto rico, Establish Liability state Violation of Procedural or Substantive Due Process, rights.

The Defendant Christopher Wray "knowingly Allowed "Color of Law Agent Violate the Plaintiff well Under Due Process. Along with Allowed Him to Violate his oath and Commit the Violation that Affected the Plaintiff under 903. 18 U.S.C s 1001 False statement, Concealment Survey of White Collar Crime 32 AM Crim L Rev 137,323-346(1995) O. Obermairer an 12 morvillo, white Collar Crime Business and regulator Offense s 10.02 (1990) discussing sec 1001) 1341,1343) Provisions 9-42.010 -coordination of chap 9- 42.001.

"Christopher Wray" \* Failure to intervene\* Under his Agencies "Color of Law" State of Color " Allow his Employee, Chris of that division to Neglect his Duties to uphold the Oath in his Job, to enforce werè Clear Law was Broken Undeer (Sec 5 -102 civil rights Violation). 1983 Deprivation of Civil rights (Jennings V. Schumann 567 f 2d 1213,1219,20,3d (cir 1977) Violates the Constitution under " Civil Rights Protections Sec1983 Federal

Guaranteed Civil Rights US Supreme Court under 1983. (Sec 1983 United states Code hold police and Government Agencies, state officials an other Public Employees can face Legal Repercussions when they fail to Protect the Constitution.

US Amend X the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Due Process Clause- Provides "nor Shall any state deprive any Person of Life, Liberty, or Property, with out Due-Process of Law." US. Const Amend XIV, s 1v. that gives the "Plaintiff" Equal Protection Rights of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment.<maltz. Distinguish Professor of Law at Roger University – Camdon. Vest Congress with Authority Adopt "Appropriate Legislation" to enforce other Parts of the Amendments Sec 5, Constitution Powers and Duties of Congress.

Under 2 people of Authority working for 1 Hold up the Oath to Protect a Person ' Civil Rights and Enforce Law.

Agent "Chris of Color of Law Division. # 2 "Christopher Wray' failed his Acting Duties of a "SUPERVISORY ROLE" "Acting Director of the FBI AGENCY, failed by Violating to uphold the (US Con Article II sec 2 Phillip Constitution, the rule Procedure Judicial Decisions apply Interpreting the Laws of the Constitution shall form Part of the Legal systems the Phillipiness. Director of the FBI Christopher Wray" Allowed the 18 U.S.C. S 1001 stat 903. False statement Concealment, under his own Agency, done by sworn in Affirmation Document via Probable Cause statement "done by State of Wisconsin Kristen Menzel" and detective Eric Mullenbach, Michelle Fink. Witch is a Uploaded Document on Court of recorded, that is held at the FBI Agency, an knows under Authority of law the Fondulac County Court House. This includes Police Reports that reflect the Unlawful Acts under Fraud and scheme and\*1342 Frauds and swindles \*\*1348 securities and Comedies Fraud.1343 fraud by wire (42 U.S.C 5122) affects financial institution.

Concealing Fraud Crime by US issued Check and US Bank affects Financial institution.

This include 1 USB Drive and 2 CD's that was held by the copy given to Stahmann by her Attorney from Discovery. With Holding of these Document Under Federal Protected Activity Being of Building a Person Working Under a Division 18 U.S.C 245 that allowed 18 U.S.C s 242 misconduct by Law Enforcement & other Government Actors willfully deprive of a Person of a right or Privilege Protected by the Constitution or Laws of the United States. Christopher Wray Knowingly allowed under his direction for his "own employee fail to uphold the Oath of his Duties and allowed "many Individuals , \*stat 948 intent Defraud U.S or Person (quating United States V. Price, 623 f2d 597, 591 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir 1980) with Evidence of Affirmation and Physical Evidence of Fraud that caused Harm to the "Plaintiff" under Sec 249 Subsection (a)(2)(B ) Criminalizes the Act in Subsection (a)(3) of 249 (statue Criminalizes 18 U.S.C s 245, this falls under 42 U.S.C s 3631 and cites (McCulloch V. Maryland ) Art I sec 8, with jurisdictional element to obtain a Conviction.

This Act Knowingly Done gives "beyond Doubt" Holds Physical Evidence of Fraud Done by "Individuals" an given "Written Complaint "Supervisory under 18 U.S.C 242 for these reason. To continue beyond doubt to Prove these Violations of his Authority as an Acting Role and Duties to serve for the U.S. "Christopher Wray has been Served Papers Xs 3 that these Crimes were Committed. Given the "Defendants" A,ple Opportunity to report the UNLAWFUL Acts of (stat 923. 18 U.S.C 371 Conspiracy to defraud the United States Primaray to Cheat the Government out of Property or Money (see project tenth Annual Survey of White Collar Crime, 32 AM. Crim. L Rev. 137,379-506 (1995) (generally

Discussing s 371) Proof beyond doubt, the Crime was Committed and failed the Role of the Defendant "Christopher Wray" a knowingly Act having Poss. Of a U.S Government Check, by fraud done by more than one Person" falls under a Organized Crime" depriving the U.S of its s 1348 Securities and Comedies, under 18 U.S.C 1348 adopted in 202 of- Sarbanes-Oxley Act. The Defendant Knowingly held Evidence in his Agency, that can be Proven by their Evidence U.S Department of Justice office and by wire Uploaded Under Evidence, by Documents this Under "United States V. Blaszak, depriving the US Government of the Amount of 1,400 dollars and has the Authority and resources to hold the Individuals Accountable for Fraud and scheme.

18 U.S.C 1348 United states V. Blaszczak. The Defendant Christopher Wray knowingly has Evidence of the Crime, Under a Organized Crime. That #1 Financial Institution, that follows names of Specific Individuals #3 Property of the United States Financial Funds, of being a economic stimulus Check issued by the Department of treasury. Cheating the Government from Unrecovered Funds Violates 18 U.S.C s 1343 under wire fraud and Alternatives these are defined "under section 102 of the Robert T Stafford Act 42, USC 5122 or affects a financial institution under 18 U.S.C.A s 1343 (1)(2)(3) – Cesnik V.

Edgewood Baptist Church, 88 F.3d 902(11<sup>th</sup> Cir 1996)

Defendant "Christopher Wray "knowingly had Ample Opportunity to prove to the Courts, give the "Plaintiff" along with the United States US 148 state rights Guaranteed by the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment, under Civil Rights Act 1866) Sec 2 Empowers to enforce Sec1 as famous words of (Mcculloch V Maryland) an 1819 decision. Article VI debt, Supremacy, oaths Religious test and Article V a 4<sup>th</sup> Clause in the 9<sup>th</sup> Section of 1<sup>st</sup> Article and that no state without its Consent, shall deprive of it Equal Suffrage in the Senate.

Equal Protections 13<sup>th</sup> 14<sup>th</sup> 15<sup>th</sup> Amendment Sec 2 Legislation Civil Rights Law. An under his Duties is now Violating the U.S of Civil Right Act – Monroe V Pope 365 U.S 1667,173-74(1961) general limiting (see 1983 action Supa Note 1 at 1486 -94 Note 3 Supa Provisions, this is Christopher Wray's Duties to Uphold Law Under Supervisory of Agencies, and to report Under Policy of National Security issues that reflect on Endangerment to the U.S Securities and Territory and Sectors. Along with Uphold the US. Constitution, not Commit "ANY Unlawful Acts even as a Individual.

Given his Duties and responsibilities failed to uphold, The Plaintiffs Equal Protections under US Amend X the 15<sup>th</sup> Amendment Due Process Clause with Importance Provide "Clause" Nor Shall any state deprive any Person of Life, Liberty or Property without Due Process Law US Const Amend XIV s 1v. Equal Protection Rights 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment < Maltz. Distinguish Professor of Law at Roger University-Camdon Vest Congress with Authority Adopt "Appropriate legislation to enforce other Paarts of the Amendment Sec 5 Constitution Powers and Duties of Congress. Amendment XIV sec 5 Provisions of this Article Sec1.

After Reviewing the Law, the Plaintiff filled "Complaint int the Federal Court, US Eastern District Milwaukee wi, under 1983 to enforce where Federal Law and Violations were done. Could have been Settled with Proper Jurisdiction in U.S Eastren District Milwaukee Wi.

The Plaintiff filled On Dec26th, 2023 with the Defendant "Christopher Wray " of how he failed his Duties to enforce the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Under 18 U.S.C 242, which holds a Important Clause under "Provisions" Equally Provisions was "Statement that "Nor Shall any state deprive any Person(s) of Life Liberty, or Property with Out Due Process of Law, nor deny to any Person within Jurisdiction, the Equal Protection of the Laws". The right to Due Process of Law and Equal Protection of the Law now applied to Both Federal and State Goverments, became Part of the Supreme Law of Land First Section, 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment also nationalize the Bill of Rights by making it Binding Upon States Amendment XIV Section 1 – Sec 5 and Sec 5 "Congress shall have Power to enforce by appropriate Legislation, the Provision of this Article.

Given the Defendant Christopher Wray "Authority to be held accountable for his actions, that Harmed the Plaintiff, in violating her Human rights, and Civil Right, and Liberties, not give the "defendant Any Type of Immunity. When the Defendant Violates his Duties and Fails to uphold the Sec 1983 United Code holds Police and Government Agencies, state Offical and other Public "Employees can face Legal repercussions when they fail tp Protect the Constitution. Under Equal Protections the Defendant Christopher Wray, "Failed to intervene ... this caused harm by fase imprisonment '11.404 (any person of any manor deprived another ETT V Linnn- Mar .Sch Dis 656 N.W 2d IWOW 2002. This Violates Under federal Law, failure to uphold his Position as a "Director of the FBI Agency of Milwaukee Wi.

<sup>1983</sup>  
\*Under <sup>1983</sup> ~~1983~~ Section Alllowas a Person to <sup>Sue</sup> ~~be sue~~ a Individule Under Federal Court. Under His Authority is not "Impossible to Prove as Long as there was a "Complaint" Given Prior to the Suit regarding Employee Misconduct, or a Violation that states a Organized Crime. An how it Violates his Duties as the "Individule " Keyword "Individule Not Agency, unless prove a Buisness was involved in a scheme Under Federal Law. Permits Being Able to Sue under Other Authorites but Allows a State Attorney General or US Attorney Generals to Sue the Agency Under Buisness of a Organized Crime This Includes Any Person from the US Supreme Courts. Or Senate or Congress.

Dec 26<sup>th</sup>, 2023 there was a Co,plaint Filled at the U.S EAstren District under Concent to "Proceed Under A MagtrAITED Judge, an Under IFP Motion

After Filling the Complaint as on Record Shows "Violations of Internal Operating Procedure Under (see Fed R App 47 Fed Cir 47(c) .

That same day dec 26<sup>th</sup> 2023 of filling as "COURTS Document 9-1 filled on 1-18-24 Pg 1 Shows the Courts Action. "States Stephn C Dries as Magistrate Judge. On Dec 26<sup>th</sup> 2023 Shows "Incomplete Paper work on Doc 9-1 and Sent via Mail to the Plaintiff Per Court Rules of Procedure, the Courts are suppose to wait intill the Paperwork is Submitted back within 21 days "Pur if any Argument, that would even give the Court INCOMPLETE Paperwork. Well Pending Paperwork was wasiting for how the "Plaintiff" wanted to Proceed, On Dec 27<sup>th</sup> 2023 the "Courtset/Clear flags (Jad) which the Internal Operating Procedures Under

Fed R A[[ 47 Cir R 47(c ) Paragrah 1 an 2 Rule 201 (i) Paragrah (2) recognizes that discovery may Proceed on ther than Jurisdictional issues before the Court rules on objecting Party "Motion Objecting Jurisdiction. Now the Difference is the Jurisdiction was the Courts Magistrate Judge . Witch is not a "District Judge. ThViolation of that Rule was the Defendant would have had to file a motion after the Court Deciedes on where the Magistrated Judge would decide on the Case. "this than would allow the Defendant to Object to that Jurisdiction.

The Court Failed Policy and Court Rules Under Amendment Sec 2-301 Paragrah (2) Shows No Motion of a Decision by the Court to give the Defendant a Filled Motion Proceding Jurisdiction.( See rule 201 Generak Discovery Provisions)

Under Gov Rule 10, Existance of Conflict, Violation of Oath. (See Doc 9-1 shows on 1-11-24, A Judgement was Issued by The Presiding Judge "Brett Ludwig " US District Judge Milwaukee Wi Case number 23-cv-1724 .

After The Ruling Sent By mail to the Plaintiff under title II Cites Section 10905 Oath Office Violation of the Oath and Penalty.

Violation Of Oath The US Con Article II Sec 2 Phillip Constitution General Rule Buenaseda V Flavier Presumption Against Violation of Internarow Law Article II Sec 2 Phil Constitution the rule Procedure Judicial Decisions Apply Interpreting the Law of the constitution shall form Part of the legal systems the Phillipiness.

Furthermore On 1-11-24 Estiblish Statutory Interpretation Chap3 Statutoty Scheme "Legislative Intent -Socorro Ramirez VS -Hon Court of Appeal and Easter Gardy G.R. No. 93833 September 25 1995,298 SCRA 590 (Cites true intent ( Commissoner of Customs Vs-ESSO Standard Eastern,Inc 66 SCRA 113 (975 Sec6.... Under Doc 5 filled on 1-11-24 Pg 1 of 5 Case # 23-cv-1724 -Bhl – VS – "Original Complainant" filled on Dec 26<sup>th</sup> 2023 # 23-cv-1724 , knowinly Given Statement by the Ruling of Presiding Judge Brett Ludwig is Vioation of Oath. Given Written and Filled Doc5 on 1-11-24 goes with , Legislative Intent- the Rule Causes Omissus Pro Omissio Harbende . Est ) Clearly Establish ( Cites pp VS. Guillermo Manatan NO L -14129 July 31,1962,5 SCRA 684. This Hold Policy of Court Subordinate - Rupublic VS Hon Cites Eutrupio Migrino and Troadio tecson.

Given General Rule -Buenaseda V- flaviere Presumption Against Violation of Internarow Law Article II Sec 2 Phil Constitution the Rule of Procedure Judicial Decissions Applying "Interpreting the Laws of the Constitution Shall for Part of the Legal Systems Phillipiness- cite 78ID, 76ID at 35 Cite 77ID @29 Cites Pragmatist.

Furthermore The Findings of the tect , that "Interpreting the Laws "(see Doc 5 Pg 1-5 Pg 2 Under Jennings No 15-1204 Slip OP 14 (Spottong Constituional lssues does not give the Court Authority to rewrite a statue as it Please, Instead Canon Permits a Court to Choose between Competing Plausible Interpretations of Statutory Text (Citations Omitted. On Doc 5 Violates this giving(Cites Omitted) By citing behind Each Judges Ruling Harmful Presumptions Textulist Under III thems KingV Burwell.

Statement \*see Page 2 of 5 "Screeening the "Complaint " The judge States Rule 8 and Accusation of the "Defendant -Unlawfully harmed me."then cites Ah

## Statement

"Cites Ashcroft V Iqball. "fact Now where in the Original Complaint State" Unlawfully- Harmed me accusation. To be Exact to "Show "Proof Beyond doubt of title II Cites Section 10905 Oath of office Violation of Oath and Penalty. (see Complaint files on Dec 26 th 2023 23-cv-1724)

The Statement specifically reads, "The date of Violation and reason(s) for Relief and the Amount in Damages Under " Failure to Uphold his duties and allowed the Misconduct and Federal Law to be Violated, and Why it Belonged in Federal Court, "(see Doc 5 filled 1-11-24 Pg 1-5 Cites Statement Under Text, that Violate "Jennings no 15-1204 OP 14 ( Spotting Constitutional issues, this does not give the Court Authority to Rewrite a statute as it Pleases. Instead Cannon Permits a Court to Choose between Competing Plausible Interpretations of Statutory Text (citations Omitted). This leads to title 18 U.S.C sec 245 Federal Protected Activities. US Eastern District Court house Build ran by the United States Under Document 5 , Electronically filled. This lead to (Rule 201 General Provisions Article II rule 201(b) (4) electronically stored information upon, the Documents Store in the title 18 U.S.C Sec 245 that is Under "Statutory Interpretations Chap 3...Legislative Intent – Socorro Ramirez VS- Hon G.R No.93833 steptember 25.1995.248 SCRA 590( Cites true Intent Commissioner of Customs VS- Esso Standard Eastern, Inc 66 SCRA 113(975 Sec6... Follows Legislative Intent, The rule Causes – Omissus Pro Omissio Harbendu EST) Clearly Establishes( Cites pp vs Guillermo Mallaton No(L-14129 july 31, 1962, 5 SCRA 684.... Policy of Courts Subordinate Rupblic VS- Hon (cites Eutro pio mig rino & troadio tecson. Under General Rule- Buenaeda V-Flaviere Presumption Against Violation of internarrow Law Article II sec2 Phil Constitution the Rule of Procedure Judicial Decisions applying Interpreting the Laws of the Constitution Shall form part of the Legal Systems the Phillipines.

Furthermore, follow a "Statutory Scheme Legislative text on Document 5 Case # 23-cv-1724 1-11-24. This Document Under Article II NLRB v Noel finding in text makes it so Ambiguous, that allows the Supreme Court Provide that the relevant "Intra -session, that Consistent Pattern of Behavior by Congress and the Executive branch, effective by ratifying the Presidents Power as thus Construed NLRB. NOEL canning (2014)

Furthermore – On the Document leads to the U.S Eastren District Milwaukee WI Violating, Sec 2 Civil Rights Law Legislative, along with Equal Protection Rights sec5 of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment < Maltz. Distiguish Professor of Law at Roger University -Camdon. Vest Congress with Authority Adopt " Appropriate " Legislation to enforce congress.

By Failure to uphold the US Constitution and Supreme Law of Land. No Federal or state Law (Statues) Enacted by the US Congress must be Followed by every state in the country. (3) Constitutional Provisions Federalism aside, three key Principles are the Crux of the Constitution Separations of Powers, checks & balances and bicameralism.

Article VI Paragraph 2 of the US. Constitution is commonly referred to the Supremacy Clause. It establishes that the Federal Constitution & Federal Law generally take Precedence Over state Laws & Constitutions.

" CLAUSE is important to Provision in the Constitution. Oaks spoke US. Constitution contains least five divinely insured Principles 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment "Clause #3. Article VI Oaths.

Article VI Supreme Law Clause 1 Obligations of New Federal Government Clause 2 Supremacy Clause, ArtVI c2.1. Art Vi c2.1 and Art VI. C2 Historical background. Article VI c2.2.1 Articles of Confederation and Supremacy of federal Law. ArtVI C2.2.2 Supremacy Clause and Constitutional Convention, Art VI c2.2.3, ArtVI c2.3 Doctrine, Art VI c2.3.1. Art VI c2.3.3 , Art VI c2.3.4.

- Clause 3 Oath of Office Art VI c3.1 Art VI c3.2, Art VI c3.2.1 Art c3.2.2.
- This Conclude the Document on Doc 5 on 1-11-24 on Ruling of case # 23-cv-1724 in U.S Eastern District Milwaukee Wi .

\*Now Provided on Appeal Under US 153 statue on Judicial inclusion and exclusion (Davidson V. New Orleans,96 U.S 97.96 US. 104 on Doc 9-1

\*Further concludes there was a Appeal Document filled of Notice of Appeal on 1-18-14 case 23-cv-1724 Rhoda Stahmann -VS- Christopher Wray this leads to Fraud for fact on the Original filled Document was "Stamped with Clear Evidence then was filled by th "Clerk USDC EDWI filled 2024 Jan 18 P 2:50, This Persist with 3 pages of attachment of Statement to the Appeals. This states on Document 9-1 that the Clerk of Courts received this Document with Attachments on 1-18-24 This States Clear Evidence that they Acknowledged the filling on that same day.

\*\* On 1-18-24 filled Document of 9-1 was sent by Mail with filled Documents number located at the Bottom of the Page, Case # 23-cv-1724- BHL Document 9 and Doc 7 and Doc 9-1, Sent Via Mail of Doc 7 case 23-cv-1724, This was noticed a falsified Document Altered by the U.S Eastern District. \*\* (This was recognized well filling in Order of filling that this Particular Doc 7 was altered. On Document Filled Vs- Sent via Mail Does Violate the Court (18 U.S.C s 1001 903 Survey of White-Collar Crime 32 Am Crim L Rev 137, 323 -346 (1995 sec 101 obermairer and 12 Morville, white Collar Crime Business and regulator offenses s 10.02(1990) discussing sec 1001) 1341,1343 Provisions 9-42.010- Coordination of Chap 9-42.001. This was sent with letter that this was sent to the Appeals Court to Chicago IL 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court of Appeals. Was noticed this Particular filled Document was False. The Original filled document was filled Showed the Difference of the Following. The Stamp states(U.S Eastern District Court Eastern District filled 2024 Jan 18 P 2:51.

\*\* The Document has different "FONT The heading of the Document and Stamp by the,(T) (in COURT) the fraud Document is in the Middle of the T VS- the Original Document is Located on the top of the (T) of Court.

\*\*\* This Document Electronically sent to the Appeals Court on 1-18-24 to Case# 23-1079 Rhoda Stahmann VS- Christopher Wray. Under 903. False statements Concealment (18 U.S.C s 1001 Survey of White Collar Crime 32 AM Crim L Rev 737 323-346(1995) Sec 101 O. Obermairer & 12

Morville, White Collar Crime Business and regulator offenses s 10.02(1990) discussing Sec 101 (1341,1343) Provisions 9-42.010 Coordination of Chap 9-42.001.

\*\* On 1-18-24 Received a case opening the appeals Court, that states a Pending IFP Pending in D.C that states the Transcript Information Sheet Due 2-1-24 and Docketing statement Due 1-25-24.

\*\*8On 1-30-24 was mailed a Notice that the District Court denied a Motion of reconsider on IFP motion Case # 24-1079 and the filling for Docket fee was Due or File for IFP in their Court at the Appeals Court 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit Chicago IL.

\*\*\*\* On 2-1-24 Rule to Show Cause Docketing Statement was Due within 14 days to the Court of Appeal 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit Chicago IL.

\*\*\*\* On 1-30-24 The U.S EEastern District Milwaukee Wi Sent the decision of the IFP reconsider Doc12 Case # 23-cv-1724-BHL. This Document is a False Document issued by the Court and Presiding Judge Brett Ludwig under the Requirement due to (18 U.S.C s 1001 903. Survey of White Collar Crime 32 m Crim L Rev 137,323-346(1995) sec 101 O.Obermairer and 12 morville, white Collar Crime Business and regulator offenses s 10.02(1990) discussing sec 1001 (1341,1343) Provisions 9-42-001. Presiding Judge Brett Ludwig. This was issued after the Ruling of Doc 9 and 9-1 and Doc 7 and issued under false Claim of his Ruling on "Statutory Interpretations" that was done by tittle II Cites Sec 10905 oath of Office Violation of Oath and Penalty..... Witch follows Doc 12 filled 1-30-24 23-cv-1724-BHL

\*\*\* Feb 8 2024 Case # 24-10799 states Letter filled on feb 7<sup>th</sup> 2024 filled Docketing Statement March 11<sup>th</sup> 2024 Motion Filled for Permission to Appeal in IFP was Denied . Case # 24-1079 U.S Court of Appeals for the 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit. Filled Feb20th 2024.

## Statement

\*\* March 11<sup>th</sup> 2024 Motion for Permission to Appeal in IFP, this motion was denied, by U.S Appeals Court 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit Chicago IL, Case # 24-1079 this was Filed with the Court on Feb 20<sup>th</sup> 2024. Rhoda Stahmann VS Christopher Wray Presiding Judge , John Z. Lee Circuit Judge & Doris L Pryor, Circuit Judge

\*\*\*\*\* March 25, 2024, Case #24-1079 Rhoda Stahmann VS- Christopher Wray, The U.S Court of Appeals for the 7<sup>th</sup> circuit, received this motion on March 21,2024 Motion of reconsider Denied Presiding Judge was John Z. Lee, Circuit Judge- & Doris L. Pryor, Circuit Judge

\*\*\*April 17<sup>th</sup> 2024 Case # 24-1079, Rhoda Stahmann VS- Christopher Wray The Case Docket That was Filed on Jan 18<sup>th</sup> 2024, is Dismissed for Failure to Pay the require Docketing Fee, Pursuant to Circuit Rule 3 (b ) This was sent Via mail from the U.S Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit

\*\*\*\* April 17<sup>th</sup> 2024 Case # 24-1079 Rhoda Stahmann VS- Christopher Wray Notice of ISSUANCE OF MANDATE Received states Herewith is the Mandate of this Court in this Appeal, along with the Bill of Cost, if any. A Certified Copy of the Opinion/Order of the court and Judgement, if any, and any direction as to Cost Shall Constitute the Mandate. States Type of Dismissal Circuit Rule 3 (b) and Status of the Record: no record to be returned.

\*\*\* With This Statement to the U.S Supreme Court, that Gov Rule 10 Existence of a Conflict between Decision(s) Which review is Sought and Decision of Another Appellate Court on the same issue.

This Leaves From Beginning of the Statement of the Complaint Filed Dec 26<sup>th</sup> 2023, Located at the U.S Eastern District Court Case # 23-cv-1724, that left the Court with Violation of Internal Operating Procedures that follows under, Under Fed R App47 Cir R37(c ). This Left a Violation of Paragraph 1 & 2 Rule 201 (i) Since the Amendment to Sec 2- 301 Paragraph (2) recognizes that discovery may Proceed on other than Jurisdictional issues before the Court. (This Violates the Ruling from the Presiding Judge Brett Ludwig, For Jurisdiction was not Established at the time by Court Rules. Witch Violates the Amendment of the U.S Eastern District Courts. Proper Procedures and Law where Broken. This Ruling was done by The Judge Brett Ludwig on 1-11-2024.

\*\* On This Ruling on 1-11-2024 Document(7) by the Presiding Judge of the U.S Eastern District Court as a District Judge then Caused a start of a "Statutory Interpretation" to the Violation of of Civil Rights Law Sec(2). The Equal Protection Rights Defined in Sec (5) of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment < Maltz. Distinguish Professor of Law of Roger University – Camdon. Vest Congress with Authority Adopt "Appropriate Legislation to Enforce other Parts of the Amendment (see Sec 5 Constitution Powers and Duties of Congress.

- This Ruling Furthermore Continues Now under (18 U.S.C s 1001 903 Survey of Whit Collar Crime Business and 12 Morville, White Collar Crime Business and Regulator Offenses s 10.02 (1990) Discussing Sec 1001) 1341, 1343) Provisions 9-42.010- Coordination of Chap 9-42.001 ( False statement) On ruling by Brett Ludwig on 1-11-24. This Does not match the Complaint to the "Plaintiff Submitted on Dec26th 2023. This Leads to a Nation Security Risk "fact Beyond Importance to the Case Due to the Higher Authority and Their Position Working as a U.S District Judge in Milwaukee Wi that is suppose to make Clear sound minded Decision on a ruling. Provided by Documentation of any Court Finding and Follow with Facts that Represents the Complaint. (Document (7)
- Furthermore, Continues with Law that was Broken by the Title II Sec 10905 Oath of Office Violation of Oath and Penalty. Case # 23-cv-1724 Presiding Judge Brett Ludwig on 1-11-224. U.S Eastern District Doc(7)
- Furthermore Continues with Being a Filled Court Document on 1-11-24 Case number 23-cv-24, Fails Under the "Statutory Scheme ( ID citing a Statement by Sen Lautenberg (See ID at 435(Robert CJ dissenting and indeed Amplified) Scalia & Garmer, Supa Note 5 at XXVII (ID @ 85) (ID) 2 29 also located in App(B) Court Opinions
- Furthermore: Document 7(23-cv-1724) The Ruling that was issued in the U.S Eastern District Court on 1-11-24 case #23-cv-1724, Presiding Judge Brett Ludwig Committed Statutory Interpretation( Chap 3 ...Legislative Intent Socorro Ramirez VS- Hon Court of Appeal and Easter Gardy G.R No.93833 September 25 1995, 248 SCRA 590(cites true intent) Commissioner of Customs VS- Esso standard Eastern, Inc 66 SCRA 113 (975 sec 6 (Located App..(B) Opinions

- Legislative intent -The Rule Causus Omissus Harbendu Est) Clearly Establishes (Cites pp vs Guillermo Manantan No L-14129 July 31, 1962, 5 SCRA 684...(Located App(B) opinions (23-cv-1724)
- Policy of Courts Subordinate – Republic VS-Hon (cites Eutrupio Migrino & troadio tecson.... (App(B) Opinions Case # 23-cv-1724
- General rule on- Buenaseda V- flaviere Presumption Against Violation of Internarow Law Article II Sec 2 Phil Constitution the Rule of Procedure Judicial Decisions, applying Interpreting the Laws of the Constitution Shall from Part of the Legal Systems the Phillipiness... (App (B) Opinions Case #23-cv-1724

\*\* Giving the Judges Decision Of His Ruling and This Being in a U.S Building Leads to a Electronically Stored Information, for using the U.S Computer System that is Electronically Uploaded in the, U.S Eastern District Court under 945 Federal Protected Activities. This Follows \*\* U.S Supreme Court under 1983 West -v-atkins 487 U.S 42 49(1988 Quoting united states Classic 3313 U.S 299 326 (1941) when the wrongdoer is Clothed with Authority of state Law ... App(B) Opinions

\*\*\* This is now for the Fact of the Fillings from case # 23-cv-1724 in U.S Eastern District Court (Complaint)- Dec 26<sup>th</sup> 2023 to the Ruling 1-11-18 (Doc 7 Courts Ruling by Judge Brett Ludwig. This follows with the Appeal That was filled on 1-18-24 case # 23-cv-1724 at the U.S Eastern District, sent to the U.S Court of Appeals 7<sup>th</sup> Cir, case 24-1079 Under (68 scalia & Garner, Supra note 5 at XXVII, 69 see ID( Argueing textualism will discourage Legislative free riding, where by legal drafter idly assume that judges legal drafter idly issue that will save them from their Blunders) 70 ID (71 ID at 376) (ID at 375 to be government of laws sat and not what the People who drafted the Law Intended) 73 Katzma NN, Supra note 53 at 10 74( but see ID at 29( at times even when the Statute is Plain on its face, The Judge may find #1,#2, #3,#4,#5,#6... (see App (B ) opinions.

2 (RN)

\*\*\*\* Sec 942 (cites Carpenter, 484 U.S @27(Quoting Mcnally V United State, 483 U.S 350,358(1987) Quoting Hammerschmidt V. United States, 265 U.S 182,188 1924( the Concept of Fraud) the fraudulent Appropriation ID (Quoting grin v Shine 187 US 181, 189 (1902)...App(B) Opinions

## Statement Summary

\*\* The Defendant Christopher Wray is a Person who is Employed by the United States, who was elected by President, who was given a Role and Responsibilities to Uphold Law in General, along with Important Duties ### National Security Issues Arise to Provide the U.S of the house and Senate and Congress along with Direction to all his Agencies that should be Properly Notified to Protect the Securities of the United States along with all of The United States Citizens an U.S Buildings. This allows his Agencies to Properly address any Problems that Persist to Protect the United States. This allows the United states to work together to Protect Citizens from threats against the United states and his Employees to do their Jobs that hold a greater Positions to Protect. This includes that them being FBI and Prosecuting Federal Case(s) throughout the United States, given fair and opportunity for Protection of the Positions they Hold. This would include what is states in this Case the Color of Law who is to Protect ones, who's rights are Violated, along with the Division of White-Collar Crimes, along with Cyber Security and the Intelligence, that hold a Bigger range of Protecting threats against America. This would Follow Security Fraud when Individuals of a Organized Crime that in tails, US Territory and Illegally used Sectors of the United states, and a bigger threat when Learned it came from Individuals of a higher Position that Violated not Just the Plaintiff" but the United states for his Own Benefit and Gain. This does follow under Impeachment that has been already brought before the house. Under Rule \*\*607 (B) Reasonable basis Along with Rule 609 Impeachment by Evidence of Conviction of Crime (A) General Rule.

\*\*\* Since This Gov rule 10 and can also Bring in his Higher Level of Authority Brings to Rule 11 Code of Civil Procedure II allows Courts to Sanction Attorneys for Violations... Since the Impeachment Process is already in Place does Run a Greater risk of Rule Rule 201 General Discovery Provisions under Part € article II 201(b) (4) and ( c ) (1) and (2) (3) be enforced in this Case. Also Rule 27 Permits Pre – action Providing Testimony. This also may involve Subparagrah (3) Slack (b) RM(c ). This can follow with anyone of the People of Higher Authority to Grant Written Briefing back to the Defendant, with any Questions that arise throughout this Petition.

\*\*\* Due Note Under the fact of Such that I am a Individual Who Stuck up for her rights and violated by this Defendant that meets the requirement "beyond Doubt" that #1 Defendant is a Supervisory Role for the Fbl Agencies.

#2) Under his Direction violated the Constitution for the US and allowed under his Direction for the Employee Misconduct in the up Highest Manor of them allowing to violate their Job Duties and put the United States National Security at risk, with

Proof Providing beyond Doubt. That Christopher Wray Violated his Duties of Office and Allowed the US and Federal and state Laws to be Continually Violated.

#3 Under Christopher Wrays Direction allowed a organized crime to Continue and allowed not only his employees to Participate in these Unlawful acts but also A U.S District Judge of Milwaukee to Commit UNLAWFUL acts and allowed him to violate the US Constitution an Run a Great Risk of National Security give his job title Position and after knowingly known the Crime Committed in the up most

Higher Manor and Continue. Is Grounds for the U.S supreme Court to File Pursuant against Christopher Wray, and even walk out of Office with out the Impeachment Process for the Law that was Broken.

#4 This not only Violates the Individual the Plaintiff but also Violates the US and State.

#5 Asking the Court under a Emergency given the Greater Risk toured the United States Filled Under Emergency to where Action can Be Taken, give the Circumstances, and Fact of Violation of Text in the U.S District Court and him Conspiring in the acts of a Organized Crime, involving Higher Authority and a Powerful Agency that will put Cases at Compromise throughout the United States.

#6 This fails all his Roles and duties set out by the President of the United States and Violates all of his acting Duties too Protect the United States.

Leaves Up most Judicial Decision and Fact of Importance of National Security that is being Compromised Each day this Individual is held in Office.

## IX Argument

I Rhoda (stahmann) Nelsen Filled a Complaint on March 30<sup>th</sup> 2023 located at the FBI Building in Milwaukee Wi, Under 18 U.S.C 242 depravation of Life and the Conduct done by the Employee, Color of Law Division" Chris. I wrote on the top of the letter FBI Agency Supervisory. Then a Brief statement on what the Law Enforcement along with a Phy Doctor,(Evaluator for competencey from the Wisconsin Forensic Unit wrote up, on a evaluation that was presented to the Courts, under Due Process. The evaluator Phy Doctor Committed Perjury and had given the FBI a Copy of the evaluation. This Caused Damage to one's life under Deprivation of life because the FBI, already had in Procession that Fraud took Place Via electronic, along with Reports that the State of Wisconsin Was Charging a Person under False Affirmation sworn in testimony done by Eric Mullenbach, Michell Fink, Kristen Menzel (State employee) that signed a statement. This was Violation under 903. False statement. Also with holding the electronic that Shows that the state, was Presenting false testimony, to wrongfully accuse the Plaintiff. They still allowed the Proceeding to Continue in a Open Court Room, and allowed false Imprisonment under 11.404, Ett V. Linn-Mar..Sch Dis 656 N.W 2d IWOW. Clearly the Defendant Christopher Wray was well aware of the Situation and still Ignored his Duties under Policy to Deprive a Person Human Life and Civil Liberties, and risk the US of wrongful Convictions Knowing that The Detectives Working for Fondulac County and the Evidence Person Shelby braatz, that allowed the D.A to Create Security Fraud. Failed to investigate the Crime or Contact the Proper Legislation" "Protection 2 U.S Supreme court federal law and passed pursuant to this Provision. This Deprives not just one life but all-around Wisconsin U.S Amend X 15<sup>th</sup> Amendment Due Process Clause "Importance Cause nor shall any state deprive a person of life, liberty or property without Due Process Law U.s Const Amend XIV s 1v. With the United states Constitution Amendment XIV. This was in Jurisdiction to Provide Equal Protection of the Law. Instead Deprived the Plaintiff of Life. Rhoda (Stahmann) Nelsen Had a Full time Job at the Waupaca Foundry, She had a Apartment, along with a Vehicle that was a 2021 Nissan, witch was a Rental to Build Credit and was working on a transition with the Rental agency to buy or Lease the Vehicle, who was maintain all Adult responsibilities, Cared for her Kids and Was stable with no health Problems, Prior to the Charge brought against her. Had this been investigated Properly and Christopher Wray who took that Oath to Protect a Person(s) and U.S, had Properly followed Policy Started back in early 2022, before the Plaintiffs life was Deprived and Suffered from a Painful Court Process that took Life of her Collage Education and House and Everything that a Person has to live. In the beggining of 2022 I had given the FBI a Print Out of what Michelle Fink had Printed of and The Agent and I talked, briefly and suggested to get Life Lock and Change my number, for that at Some Point after looking at the Check said that it was fraud and would question them. After I had not heard anything from them on July 29<sup>th</sup> 2023, I went to the Fbi Agency and wanted to speak to there Boss, and was in the interview Room, an had talk to a Attorney General who had stated he was not from Wisconsin, caught it off his badge he showed me when he walked in. His name was Blain or Blake Shelden. He said he would look into it he has no Idea what they had done with the Complaint. After fighting with the FBI because things were not being Investigated and Life wasn't Protected. After I had to work through the Court Process after being Charged of a Crime July 20<sup>th</sup> 2022. They refused to look into it, at one-point Aug 25<sup>th</sup> 2022 around about the Color of Law agent said it, sounds like you have Something against Eric Muellenbach, and said explain it to the D.A and Judge, and directed any calls by me to their security at the Agency that he wasn't going to take any calls from me regarding the case that he was not opening a case.

I Then Filled a Case Against Christopher Wray For Violation of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment of Deprivation of life, and stated this in the Complaint filled Dec26th 2023, as you can see working through the Court Process Caused a Bigger Effect to the U.S That has Caused Statutory Scheme do to the defendant Knowing that his Agency was in Poss and concealing Fraud Statement, under 903. Survey of White Collar Crime. Done by a Organized fraud crime, under Stat 811.034 Online sunshine 1(A)(B) and definitions (a)(B)(c )(d)..

(RN) 817.034

## IX Argument

(409a)(D) Any other Provisions of Law a Criminal Proceeding Under this section may be Commenced at any time. History -s7 ch. 87-382.s1 ch 2013-208 see Policy 2 Christopher Wray allowed (App(B) 23-cv-1724-bhl Continue the case after Knowing he was in the Wrong, and Continued to Violate Guaranteed Protected Federal Rights 18.U.S.C 242. Violations of Rule 201 Impeachment under General Rule Provisions the facts Beyond Importance.

## IX .Summary of Argument

The Plaintiff went to the FBI after her and the United states Issued Check went missing, after she Contacted her Local law Enforcement to investigate the Crime of Stolen Check issued to Rhoda stahmann, from the U.S Department of treasury, Financials, of 1,400. After Stahmann realized the Law Official had broke Law after there last interview, had went to the Milwaukee WI FBI agency and Reported it. The Defendant Christopher Wray Failed his duties, and Deprived Human Life and Caused the U.S Eastern District Court Judge to make a Ruling, that has Absolutely no Interpretation to the Text. That Makes the Statutory Scheme by Legislative Text. That Violates the Oath of office under penalty, the filling of the Court under Internal Operating Procedures (Fed rule 47 and Fed Cir R 47(c ) and 18 U.S.C 242 (1) Torres V. Superindendant of Police Puerto rico Establish Liability to state Violation of Procedural or Substantive Due Process Rights. This Is So Ambiguous to the Law in Breaks Now the US Supreme Law of the Land and every Violation Under the US Constitution, to walk out of office upon Evidence of the Original Filling on Dec 26<sup>th</sup> 2023, and the Ruling by the Judge Brett Ludwig on Jan11th 2024, and Christopher Wray has in Possession of these document alone. Time 3 time Served via mail so is Guilty Beyond Doubt of Judicial Statutory Scheme Intent to Conspire (True Intent) shows 923. 18 U.S.C s371 conspiracy.

## IX. Reason for Granting Petition

Reason For Granting the Petition For Writ Certi, Is for the Importance of National Security to Protect the U.S with Clear Law Broken. Under Documents through out this Petition Prove Beyond Doubt Judicial Statutory Scheme Happen, As of April 17<sup>th</sup> 2024, Christopher Wray was mail a Copy of the Potential Pending Filling ,of all the Documents and statement, Knowing its now almost Aug 2023 July 25<sup>th</sup> 2024, and Christopher Wray has still failed His Duties and Not Reported the U.S Eastern District Court Judge, and Court for the False Documents made by the District in a federal Protected Activities, affects to Many Life's, to not Grant the Petition for review. Along with knowing that his Agency Could of Protected the U.S by a Organized Fraud, with Global Biasness and the Territory and sectors Being Illegally Used and failed to notify anyone in Wisconsin. Deprived many life's and Puts the U.S Supreme Court of Washington D.C life's at Jeopardy because the FBI is a Powerful Agency, and the Securities of US Military Intelligence, from Verint Security, was Used to Impersonate the FBI and was used to Create a Case in Fondulac County Done by Employees that work for the state of Wisconsin. D.A and Detectives to Business to Money. This is a Huge Risk that he is Putting the U.S in by allowing him and the U.S District Judge, Continue this scheme. There Is Physical Documentation of Certiport Business Of Person Vue and Photos and Listed names of the Computer information Used and the Law officials that abused it dropped off at the FBI Agency as of Feb 20<sup>th</sup> 2024. So, Beyond Doubt raise National Security Issues and Asking the US Supreme Court to Grant relief under 60(B)(1). For Whatever Amount to try and recover damages to one's life, and for any and Victims that had suffered from, Failure to Protect a Person and U.S, after reviewing the Petition of review. I am Also asking the Court to Grant the Petition to File Charges Pursuant of Federal Prosecution upon review of the findings, and any Charges the U.S Finds from the U.S Solicitor, or state attorney, that is of Higher Authority to bring Justices for the United States. Thank you For the Courts time and would like to respectfully submit this Petition.....

## CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Rhoda Nelson

Date: 4-16-24

Subscribed and sworn before me this  
16 day of April, 2024  
Jamie Steger  
Notary Public  
State of Wisconsin/Green Lake Co.  
My Commission expires: 11/30/24

