


24-5696

# In the Supreme Court of the United States

*"In the Matter of Gregory Savoy"*

Case no.



Petition No. 72

*"In the Matter of Gregory Savoy"*

September Term, 2024

Supreme Court of Maryland

Case no. 1839

*"In the Matter of Gregory Savoy"*

September Term, 2023

Appellate Court of Maryland

---

Now Brought to Stop Crimes Against the People of Many Countries  
Under Treaties Upheld by the United States of America  
is a Petition to Make a Determination of  
Imperative Public Importance to American Families

---

## On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of Maryland

---

### PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

September 28, 2024

Gregory Scott Savoy  
Pro Se, In Forma Pauperis  
DBA Greg Savoy

Contact: 703-402-8139

P.O. Box 101  
Herndon, VA 20172

## Question Presented

The following constitutional question is now vouchsafed at the Supreme Court of the United States;

**Under united rules of evidence (state and federal,) can the courts of America deny a request for judicial notice of a fact “whose accuracy cannot be reasonably questioned” when that denial aids and abets a brightline crime against humanity under Customary International Law?**

Concerning a concealed mechanism describing the cause of chemical lobotomy, the following scientific and adjudicative fact is now overripe for judicial notice;

**“However, we observed a pronounced general shrinkage effect of approximately 20% and a highly significant variation in shrinkage across brain regions. In conclusion, chronic exposure of non-human primates to antipsychotics was associated with reduced brain volume.”**

–University of Pittsburgh Primate Research Laboratory-  
2005; research held by the U.S. National Library of  
Medicine/NIH PubMed ID #15756305 — *“The influence  
of chronic exposure to antipsychotic medications on  
brain size before and after tissue fixation: a comparison  
of haloperidol and olanzapine in macaque monkeys”*

## **Party to this Proceeding**

**ATTORNEY FOR THE RESPONDENT (Office of the Comptroller of Maryland;)**

Jessica K. Wisner  
Assistant Attorney General– Attorney #1112150287  
80 Calvert Street  
Suite 303  
Annapolis, MD 21401

## Related Court Proceedings on a Central Grievance Involving Chemical Lobotomy

**SAVOY I** (the central grievance was never addressed in the lower courts)  
**Case no. 12316-12L**, was an APA case in the U.S. Tax Court (with a denial of leave to file an interlocutory appeal on a constitutional/statutory/federal question)  
**Case no. 14-1901**, APA Appeal in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit  
**Case no. 15-5054**, Supreme Court of the United States (a rightful review of the lower court decisions was converted into a “*PETITION FOR EXTRAORDINARY WRIT OF MANDAMUS AND EQUITABLE RELIEF FOR VICTIMS AND SURVIVORS OF THE SCHIZOPHRENIA SPECTRUM OF DISORDERS IN AMERICA*”)

Petition denied

(the central grievance was not acknowledged by the Supreme Court of the United States and there was no *Confession of Error* by the Solicitor General concerning the ongoing DOJ defense of nationalized chemical lobotomy)

**SAVOY II** (the central grievance was never addressed in the lower courts)  
 Ex parte motion in U.S. district court (see below) for an emergency stay of proceedings (instant) per active FRCP Rule 62(b)(4) in late Spring of 2018 [note: Rule 62(b)(4) was tragically abolished on December 1, 2018 and Rule 62 is no longer tied directly to Rule 60(b)(6)] [Savoy III, based on Rule 60(b)(6), was implicitly tied to this action in Savoy II, pointedly because old Rule 62(b)(4) was active at the outset of Savoy II)

**Case no. 3:18-cv-00086-GMG**, U.S. District Court for the N. Dist. of West Virginia

**Case no. 18-1710**, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit

**Case no. 18-8407**, Supreme Court of the United States (featuring the “Pittsburgh Study” that definitively proves brain destruction occurred)

Case considered closed

(the central grievance was not acknowledged by the Supreme Court of the United States and there was no *Confession of Error* by the Solicitor General concerning an ongoing DOJ defense of nationalized chemical lobotomy)

**SAVOY III** (the central grievance was never addressed in the lower courts)  
 A *NOTICE OF CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION* (FRCP Rule 5.1) was posted in the lower court in the action notated below while taken under Rule 60(b)(6) . . .  
**Case no. 1:20-cv-00784-LO-IDD**, U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia–Alexandria Division [a post judgment action under Rule 60(b)(6)--with a procedural interlocutory appeal taken by right pending an indicative ruling on a defamatory statement issued by the court–FRCP Rule 59(e)]

Case no. 21-1600, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit [interlocutory appeal by procedural right, pending an indicative ruling by the district court on a defamatory statement issued by the court; taken under FRCP Rule 59(e)]

Case no. 21-5674, Supreme Court of the United States [interlocutory “cert petition” by procedural right, pending an indicative ruling by the district court on a defamatory statement issued by the court; taken under FRCP Rule 59(e)]

The district court’s indicative ruling under FRCP Rule 59(e) nullifies the defamatory statement in the U.S. District Court – a three-court interlocutory procedure ends

Case no. 22-1112, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit (root case resumes on appeal)

Case no. 22-5683, Supreme Court of the United States (root case resumes on Pet. for Writ of Cert.)

Case Considered Closed

(the central grievance was not acknowledged by the Supreme Court of the United States and there was no *Confession of Error* by the Solicitor General concerning the ongoing DOJ defense of chemical lobotomy)

SAVOY IV (the central grievance was never addressed in the lower courts)

This instant petition concerning a state judiciary writ large capstones all of the Savoy IV proceedings. [SAVOY IV features ALJ proceedings in a Maryland agency, appeal by right to Maryland Tax Court, appeal by right to Anne Arundel County Circuit Court, appeal by right to Appellate Court of Maryland (ACM,) appeal by Pet. for Writ of Cert. to Supreme Court of Maryland (SCM)]

State case closed upon order from SCM for “no showing” that review is “in the public interest.” (central grievance was not acknowledged in the state courts)

\*\*\* Pet. for Writ of Cert. pending in the Supreme Court of the United States \*\*\*

## Ongoing Vexation

### SAVOY V

Exhaustion of the *Virginia Administrative Process Act*– various appeals within an agency, an appeal to an ALJ within that agency, final direct appeal to Tax Commissioner (all appeals taken under Virginia statutory law and exhausted)

Final agency *Letter of Determination* (LOD) from Tax Commissioner, March 24, 2024 (LOD is appealable to any Virginia circuit court w/domicile jurisdiction)

Therefore, a Virginia circuit court case is now pending;

Case no. CL-2024-0009030, Filed on 6/26/2024 in the Fairfax County Circuit Court, “*Gregory Scott Savoy v. The Offices of the Attorney General of Virginia and the Tax Commissioner of Virginia in their sworn duties to defend the Constitution of Virginia*”

## Table of Contents

Question Presented	1.
Party to this Proceeding	2.
Related Court Proceedings	3.
Ongoing Vexation	4.
Index to Appendices	5.
Table of American and International Authorities	6.
Table of Judicially Denied Adjudicative Facts	10.
Orders Below	13.
Jurisdiction	13.
Statement of the Case (A Prelude to Abraham Lincoln)	14.
Argument and Discussion (The Lock with a Hundred Keys)	23.
Truth and Equitable Relief (The Almanac Case)	38.
Conclusion	40.

## Index to Appendices

**APPENDIX A**— The unpublished final order in case no. 1839 in the Appellate Court of Maryland, September 2023 term, was entered on April 12, 2024.

**APPENDIX B**— The unpublished final order denying petitioner’s *Motion for Judicial Notice of Adjudicative Fact* in case no. C-02-CV-21-001340 at the Circuit Court of Anne Arundel County was entered on October 12, 2023.

**APPENDIX C**— The unpublished final order in case no. 79 in the Supreme Court of Maryland, September 2024 term, was entered on June 18th, 2024.

**APPENDIX D**— Petitioner’s *Exhibit Directory* of August 18, 2021, in case no. 19-IN-OO-0839 at the Maryland Tax Court— will assist in understanding the case. [Rule 14.1(i)(vi)]

**APPENDIX E**— The Informal Petition in the Supreme Court of Maryland (SCM) with the Informal Brief at the Appellate Court of Maryland attached (ACM,) which preserves for the federal record a properly submitted informal brief that ACM struck from the state record for “lack of an appellant’s brief.” [Rule 14.1(i)(vi)]

## Table of American and International Authorities

### 1. First Law

“The judicial Power shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States, and Treaties made, or which shall be made, under their Authority;”

–Article III, Sec. 2, Constitution of the United States  
(government under the Constitution began March 4, 1789)  
(underlined emphasis added by Gregory Scott Savoy)

### 2. United Constitutional Law on Unenumerated Rights

The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

–Amendment IX (1791,) *Constitution of the United States*

This enumeration of Rights shall not be construed to impair or deny others retained by the People.

–Article 45, *Declaration of Rights, Constitution of Maryland*

### 3. United Statutory Law Prohibiting Concealment of Evidence

Md. Code, Crim. Law § 9-307

(a) A person may not destroy, alter, conceal, or remove physical evidence that the person believes may be used in a pending or future official proceeding with the intent to impair the verity or availability of the physical evidence in the official proceeding.  
(underlined emphasis added by this petitioner)

**18 U.S. Code § 2071**

(b)Whoever, having the custody of any such record, proceeding, map, book, document, paper, or other thing, willfully and unlawfully conceals, removes, mutilates, obliterates, falsifies, or destroys the same, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years, or both; and shall forfeit his office and be disqualified from holding any office under the United States.

(underlined emphasis added by this petitioner)

**4. United Statutory Equity  
(the Saving Clauses for Fraud located within Law)**

**Maryland Rules of Court, Rule 2-535(b) REVISORY POWER**

(b) **Fraud, Mistake, Irregularity.** On motion of any party filed at any time, the court may exercise revisory power and control over the judgment in case of fraud, mistake, or irregularity.

**Federal Rule of Civil Procedure, Rule 60(b) and Rule 60(d)**

**Rule 60(b) —** On motion and just terms, the court may relieve a party or its legal representative from a final judgment, order, or proceeding for the following reasons: [(1) through (6) listed]

(3) fraud (whether previously called intrinsic or extrinsic), misrepresentation, or misconduct by an opposing party;

(6) any other reason that justifies relief

**Rule 60(d) — OTHER POWERS TO GRANT RELIEF.** This rule does not limit a court's power to:

(3) set aside a judgment for fraud on the court.

**5. United Rules of Evidence  
(Judicial Notice of Adjudicative Facts)**

**Federal Rules of Evidence**

**Rule 201. Judicial Notice of Adjudicative Facts**

(b) **Kinds of Facts That May Be Judicially Noticed.** The court may judicially notice a fact that is not subject to reasonable dispute because it:

(2) can be accurately and readily determined from sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned.

(emphasis added by petitioner)

(c) Taking Notice. The court:

(2) must take judicial notice if a party requests it and the court is supplied with the necessary information.

(emphasis added by petitioner)

### **Maryland Rules of Evidence**

#### **Rule 5-201 - Judicial Notice of Adjudicative Facts**

(b) Kinds of Facts. A judicially noticed fact must be one not subject to reasonable dispute in that it is either (1) generally known within the territorial jurisdiction of the trial court or (2) capable of accurate and ready determination by resort to sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned. (emphasis added by petitioner)

(d) When Mandatory. A court shall take judicial notice if requested by a party and supplied with the necessary information. (emphasis added by petitioner)

## **6. Customary International Law (Rome Statute)**

### **Article 7 Crimes against humanity**

1. For the purpose of this Statute, “crime against humanity” means any of the following acts when committed as part of a widespread or systematic attack directed against any civilian population, with knowledge of the attack: [(a) through (k) are listed]

(e) Imprisonment or other severe deprivation of physical liberty in violation of fundamental rules of international law;

(i) Enforced disappearance of persons;

**(k) Other inhumane acts of a similar character intentionally causing great suffering, or serious injury to body or to mental or physical health.**

**7. Countries that have Mutual Legal Assistance Treaties with the United States**

1. Countries who hold a MLAT with the U.S.: ALGERIA ANGUILLA ANTIGUA & BARBUDA ARGENTINA AUSTRALIA AUSTRIA BAHAMAS BARBADOS BELGIUM BELIZE BERMUDA BRITISH VIRGIN ISLANDS BULGARIA CANADA CAYMAN ISLANDS CROATIA CHINA CYPRUS REPUBLIC CZECH RE. PUBLIC DENMARK DOMINICA EGYPT ESTONIA FINLAND FRANCE GERMANY GREECE GRENADA HONG KONG SAR HUNGARY INDIA IRELAND ISRAEL ITALY JAMAICA JAPAN JORDAN KAZAKHSTAN LATVIA LATVIA LIECHTENSTEIN LITHUANIA LUXEMBOURG MALAYSIA MALTA MEXICO MONTSERRAT MOROCCO THE NETHERLANDS NIGERIA PANAMA PHILIPPINES POLAND PORTUGAL REPUBLIC OF KOREA ROMANIA RUSSIA SINGAPORE SLOVAKIA SLOVENIA SOUTH AFRICA SPAIN ST. CHRISTOPHER & NEVIS ST. LUCIA ST. VINCENT & THE GRENADINES SWEDEN SWITZERLAND TAIWAN THAILAND TRINIDAD & TOBAGO TURKEY

—Source: “*MUTUAL LEGAL ASSISTANCE TREATIES OF THE UNITED STATES,*,” April 2022, Office of International Affairs, Criminal Division, Department of Justice, United States of America

[Note by petitioner: some of these countries are pending, suspended, replaced by, concurrent with, or under the aegis of the larger US/EU Agreement, a treaty which is notated below at (2.)] (Additional note by petitioner; per the DOJ attribution, the MLAT with Singapore is in regard to “drug crimes only.” Nevertheless, chemical lobotomy by plain meaning is a drug crime.)

2. “Agreement on mutual legal assistance between the European Union and the United States of America”

Doc # 22003A0719(02) at EUR-LEX

And excerpted below from Doc #32003D0516 at EUR-LEX<sup>1</sup> is their verbatim mission statement on legal assistance;

“Whereas:

(1) The Member States of the European Union cooperate in criminal matters with the United States of America on the basis of bilateral agreements, conventions, treaties, national law and arrangements.”

## Table of Denied Adjudicative Facts

### 1. U.S. National Library of Medicine/NIH PubMed ID #15756305

“However, we observed a pronounced general shrinkage effect of approximately 20% and a highly significant variation in shrinkage across brain regions. In conclusion, chronic exposure of non-human primates to antipsychotics was associated with reduced brain volume.”

–University of Pittsburgh Primate Research Laboratory-  
U.S. National Library of Medicine/NIH  
PubMed ID #15756305, 2005  
(underlined emphasis added by petitioner)

(the internet search-term is the following word-cluster;  
“Pittsburgh, Monkeys, Antipsychotics, Chronic  
Exposure”)

Additional text;

“All monkeys were always given orange drink containing quinine sulfate as a taste mask to prevent the animals from knowing whether or not drug was present. During the study, animals in the haloperidol and the olanzapine groups required increasingly greater effort to maintain compliance with the dosing regimen. The animals seemed to develop an aversion to the taste and/or the subjective effects of the medication. Thus, dosing vehicles were adapted to ensure that the animals complied with drug ingestion.

–University of Pittsburgh Primate Research Laboratory-  
U.S. National Library of Medicine/NIH  
PubMed ID #15756305, 2005  
(underlined emphasis added by petitioner)

---

<sup>1</sup> 2003/516/EC: “Council Decision of 6 June 2003 concerning the signature of the Agreements between the European Union and the United States of America on extradition and mutual legal assistance in criminal matters”

## 2. U.S. National Library of Medicine/NIH PubMed I.D. #12197445

**“Differential prescription of maintenance antipsychotics to African American and white patients with new-onset bipolar disorder.” August, 2002**  
Bipolar and Psychotic Disorders Research Program, Department of Psychiatry,  
University of Cincinnati College of Medicine, Cincinnati, OH 45267-0559, USA.

BACKGROUND; “Antipsychotic medications are commonly prescribed as maintenance pharmacotherapy for patients with bipolar disorder. However, double-blind, placebo-controlled studies have yet to demonstrate a significant prophylactic effect of maintenance antipsychotic use in bipolar disorder, and long-term use of antipsychotics may place the patient at risk for neuroleptic-induced tardive dyskinesia. African American patients may be at increased risk because excess antipsychotic prescription appears to be common in this population, although this issue has not been longitudinally studied in bipolar disorder.” (emphasis added by white petitioner)

CONCLUSION: “Even when demographically similar to white patients, African Americans with bipolar disorder may be more likely to receive maintenance antipsychotic treatment. The specific reasons for this finding are not clear, suggesting that studies are warranted that examine clinicians' rationale for differentially prescribing antipsychotics for African American and white patients during the early course of bipolar disorder.”

[emphasis added by white petitioner--for the relevance of this “tie-in,” please see the Savoy II docket at the Supreme Court of the United States (case no. 18-8407,) Petition for Writ of Certiorari, last paragraph of page 29]

## 3. U.S. National Library of Medicine/NIH PubMed I.D. #33138709

**“The analysis, published online today in the journal *Psychiatric Services*, shows that in the nearly half of U.S. states for which data was available, involuntary psychiatric detentions outpaced population growth by a rate of 3 to 1 on average in recent years.”**

–Gavin Crowell-Williamson, “Involuntary Psychiatric Detentions on the Rise, Raising Ethical Questions,” November 3, 2020, MadInAmerica.com website (copyright 2022 Mad In America Foundation,) citing the UCLA Press Release of November 3, 2020, David Cohen, Research Leader, professor of social welfare at the Luskin School, UCLA; **additionally found at the National Library of Medicine, PubMed ID # 33138709 “*Incidences of Involuntary Psychiatric Detentions in***

*25 U.S. States,”* Gi Lee, David Cohen (Emphasis added by petitioner)

**“This is the most controversial intervention in mental health — you’re deprived of liberty, can be traumatized and then stigmatized — yet no one could tell how often it happens in the United States,” said David Cohen, a professor of social welfare at the Luskin School, in a press release. “We saw the lack of data as a social justice issue, as an accountability issue.”**

–Gavin Crowell-Williamson, “Involuntary Psychiatric Detentions on the Rise, Raising Ethical Questions,” November 3, 2020, MadInAmerica.com website (copyright 2022 Mad In America Foundation,) citing the UCLA Press Release of November 3, 2020, David Cohen, Research Leader, professor of social welfare at the Luskin School, UCLA; **additionally found at the National Library of Medicine, PubMed ID # 33138709 “Incidences of Involuntary Psychiatric Detentions in 25 U.S. States,”** Gi Lee, David Cohen (for clarity of attribution, the above underlined emphasis in three spots was added by Gregory Scott Savoy)

## In the Supreme Court of the United States

### Petition for Writ of Certiorari

Petitioner in deference to God prays that a writ of certiorari issue from the Supreme Court of the United States to review the orders below, inclusive of all related proceedings on a central grievance involving chemical lobotomy and inclusive of all subsidiary questions found therein;<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> There are subsidiary questions found in case no. 15-5054, case no. 18-8407, case no. 21-5674, and case no. 22-5683, all brought to the Supreme Court of the United States by Gregory Scott Savoy. There is an additional “federal question” under diversity jurisdiction that was presented at the top of case no. 1:20-cv-00784-LO-IDD at the USDC for the EDVA-Alexandria Division, a diversity jurisdiction case in which Maryland was a party. That case held a properly served “Notice of Constitutional Question.” (Doc. 36)

Additionally, a one-state focused question was presented in the lower courts of this current Maryland case and it is found at footnote #8 of page 20 located within this instant federal petition. That’s a total of six unanswered questions!

## Orders Below

The unpublished ORDER of April 12, 2024 in the Appellate Court of Maryland, appellant's informal brief dismissed for "lack of an appellant's brief," is found at **APPENDIX A**.

The unpublished ORDER of October 11, 2023 in the Circuit Court for Anne Arundel County, stating the decision of the Maryland Tax Court is **AFFIRMED** and the **Petitioner's Motion for Judicial Notice of Adjudicative Fact is DENIED**, is found at **APPENDIX B**.

The unpublished ORDER of June 18th, 2024 in the Supreme Court of Maryland, a denial of the informal petition for writ of certiorari "as there has been no showing that review by certiorari is desirable and in the public interest," is found at **APPENDIX C**.

## Jurisdiction

This case arrives from the Supreme Court of Maryland. A final order in case no. 79, *In the matter of Gregory Savoy* at the Supreme Court of Maryland (APPENDIX C) was issued on June 18, 2024 and 90 days have not yet passed upon this petition originally reaching the Supreme Court of the United States on or about September 9, 2024.<sup>3</sup> Under the timing established by Rule 13.1 of this court, jurisdiction is invoked under 28 U.S. Code § 1257(a) State courts; certiorari

- (a) Final judgments or decrees rendered by the highest court of a State in which a decision could be had, may be reviewed by the Supreme Court by writ of certiorari where the validity of a treaty or statute of the United States is drawn in question or where the validity of a statute of any State is drawn in question on the ground of its being repugnant to the Constitution, treaties, or laws of the United States, or where any title, right, privilege, or immunity is specially set up or claimed under the Constitution or the treaties or statutes of, or any commission held or authority exercised under, the United States.

(underlined emphasis added by this petitioner)

---

<sup>3</sup> This CORRECTED PETITION under Rule 14.5 is now dated September 28, 2024 and it falls within the time set forth by the clerk's letter of September, 17, 2024.

## Statement of the Case (A Prelude to Abraham Lincoln)

Once concealed, always concealed.

**THE COURT:** No, no, no: I'm trying to organize it in my head, sir. You just want me to recognize that there's been a study, but what do you intend to do with that recognition of that study? So, let's say I had the power — and I'm not sure that I do, because I'm going to take a look to see if I have the ability to do that. Let's say I do. What does that do in the context of this case, meaning the tax case, if anything?

**MR. SAVOY:** It reveals an Earth crime; the crime against humanity. You know, this same activity was tried in — (*petitioner's note: now speaking with a head-turn to opposing counsel*) you know where this was tried, don't you? The same type of activity. (*turning back to court*) This is not an old — you know, this is not like a new aspiration that's been tried upon mankind.

—Oral Argument by Gregory Scott Savoy; pages 34 to 35 of the court transcript from the hearing of September 18, 2023, case no. C-02-CV-21-001340, Circuit Court of Anne Arundel County, Maryland

This is not a suit brought by a citizen of one state against another state or even a suit brought by one citizen against his own state. [Hans v. Louisiana 134 U.S. 1 (1890)] No, this case is simply a civil procedure for winning post-judgment relief from judgments already won by the states in their own courts of law.<sup>4</sup> In those judgments, widefield extrinsic fraud upon American courts prevented the presentation of a reasonable necessity-defense for lifelong inabilities to comply with taxation commands— commands the state thrusts upon us victims of a state sponsored repugnancy. Tragically, all chemically lobotomized citizens in America have been denied a non-fraudulent “day in court,” and that denial was

---

<sup>4</sup> The easiest way for this court to locate these pre-existing state judgments is to quickly inspect the Appendices of the previous case that Gregory Scott Savoy brought to this court, case no. 22-5683; Appendix H, Appendix I, and Appendix J.

facilitated by the concealment of how they became chemically lobotomized in the first place under this state enforced iatrogenesis.<sup>5</sup> That stark act of concealment of scientific facts by state and federal authorities is fraud upon the courts of America.

There have been many crafty techniques of concealment within these regenerative proceedings in state and federal courts (vide “Related Proceedings on a Central Grievance Involving Chemical Lobotomy,” page 3, this petition.)

First, it’s not true that there was a “lack of an appellant’s brief” in the Appellate Court of Maryland. (as stated by that court at APPENDIX A) Despite being stricken from the state record, you’ll see an informal brief did exist and it was attached to the Petition for Writ of Certiorari in the Supreme Court of Maryland as a tactic of federal rescue. (vide APPENDIX E, “Attachment A”) Under laws forbidding concealment of evidence, using misdirection or feigning ignorance of a case fact is not a legal escape hatch that’s available to evade constitutional accountability, whether that feigned ignorance happens in the courts of appellate review or in courts of first instance that first heard a party presentation. And how many times must that feigned ignorance happen? Answer: as many times as it takes to keep the fact concealed.

**THE COURT: What is the fact that you’re asking me to adjudicate?**

---

<sup>5</sup> iatrogenesis; the unintentional causation of an unfavorable health condition (such as disease, injury, infection, or an adverse drug reaction) during the process of providing medical care (such as surgery, drug treatment, hospitalization, or diagnostic testing;) *Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary*, Merriam-Webster, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/iatrogenesis>. Accessed 9 Sep. 2024.

MR. SAVOY: However, we observe the pronounced general shrinking —

THE COURT: No, no; I don't want you to read it, sir. I just want you to talk to me. What — what is the — I really — I just want you to talk to me.

MR. SAVOY: That's the fact.

THE COURT: What is the —

MR. SAVOY: The fact is the federal government did a study at the Primate Research Facility at Pittsburgh.

THE COURT: You just want me to find that they did a study?

MR. SAVOY: That's right.

THE COURT: And how does that help you in your tax case?

MR. SAVOY: It's part of my equitable relief. The only way we get out of this — us, that you have destroyed beyond repair, is for all of us to come out of it together. If you make it known to the public, it would go a long ways to helping that happen, because then the public won't tolerate an attorney general — an African-American one, by the way, who happens to be the same race that's disproportionately subject to antipsychotic drugs. That study is part of this also; that could be an additional adjudicated (sic) fact. I — I just don't understand how this case even —

THE COURT: So —

MR. SAVOY: —How did this even happen?

—Oral Argument by Gregory Scott Savoy; pages 33 to 34 of the transcript from the hearing of September 18, 2023, case no. C-02-CV-21-001340, Circuit Court of Anne Arundel County, Maryland

Chemical lobotomy is repugnant to the worldwide laws of humanity and a betrayal of international society. (That's your statement of the case.)

Concerning chemical lobotomy, this court should consider the integrity of our overseas policies when considering how the American judiciary wielded law against clean-handed U.S. persons. Those overseas policies were stated at the Hague by our very own state department;

In addition, our Supreme Court has made clear that our Constitution protects certain core individual rights, including the right to a fair trial, to free speech, and to equal protection of the laws, from infringement by any legal act, including international

rules. This practice also does not distinguish us from other countries. The German Constitutional Court, for example, in the several "Solange" decisions has upheld exactly the same principle. In those cases, decided over decades, the German Court repeatedly ruled that it, and not the European Court of Justice, has the final authority to determine whether the European treaties comply with the fundamental provisions of the German Constitution. Similarly, our highest court must have the final say when safeguarding the fundamental rights enshrined in our Constitution.

And, as I noted above, far from shielding the United States from international law, our Constitution expressly recognizes treaties as the law of the land. It also authorizes Congress to define and punish offenses against the law of nations. Our Constitution does not prescribe isolationism. To the contrary, it promotes our active participation in the development and enforcement of international law.

In sum, the United States does treat international law as real law, is serious about its international obligations, and, through its legal system, assigns courts to play an important role in international law enforcement.

—John B. Bellinger, Legal Advisor  
U.S. Department of State, Remarks at  
the Hague, Netherlands, June 6, 2007

So here in America, two law procedures were brought in the lower courts of this case in which those two law procedures (when brought together in tandem) provided officers of the court a new and simple theory of humanitarian intervention for this crime with an international scope.<sup>6</sup> Further, these same exact two law procedures work to dispel the same exact crime when these two procedures are brought during civil litigation under any local, any state, or any federal scope, no matter where the victim of that crime is presently located in

---

<sup>6</sup> This petitioner recommends for this court that the old and complex theories of humanitarian intervention are best described and expounded upon here: Criddle, Evan J., *"Three Grotian Theories of Humanitarian Intervention"* (2015). William and Mary Law School, *Faculty Publications* # 1785. "The nation's oldest law school." (<https://scholarship.law.wm.edu/facpubs/1785>)

America and no matter where in America they originally got chemically lobotomized. (Equal Protection Clause, 14th Amdt., Constitution of the United States) So the two proposed procedures, taken in tandem to get relief from fraud, can set precedent and provide simple relief with a universal scope across all jurisdictions. If no relief is given, then chemical lobotomy becomes an act of depraved indifference by our custodians of law. And when authorities take depravity to these lengths there have been international judicial procedures already established to prevent such perversions. “You know where this was tried, don’t you. The same type of activity;” (court transcript, p. 14, this petition)

**“Still another defense often asserted is to the effect that if certain events happened, or certain orders or memoranda were issued, the defendant knew nothing of these transactions. Such a defense is of no avail when it appears, as it does in many instances, that the defendant urging such a defense actually issued an order or memorandum, or actually received it, or otherwise had full knowledge, at the time, of the commission of various acts.”**

--Page 154, “Trials of War Criminals Before the Nuernberg Military Tribunals Under Control Council Law no. 10,” Volume V, United States Government Printing Office, 1950, --now held at the Library of Congress  
(emphasis added by Gregory Scott Savoy)

But unfortunately, bellwether cases cannot cite themselves as precedent until a first impression ruling is made in a court with appellate jurisdiction upon a first instance of a first review of that appellate fraud in the lower courts, including, perchance, review in the Supreme Court of the United States (and there is no other to do such;) otherwise this case profoundly goes the same route of *Dred Scott v. Sandford*, 60 U.S. 393 (1857,) until alternate means deliver justice by the brute force of individuals (John Brown,) or worse, by the *force majeure* of

the states. At bottom, didn't Dred Scott's non-bellwether case only become a dispositive bellwether case after the 680,000 persons died abruptly during a war between the states?

But again, like I've told this court before; chin up and stay positive. Two law procedures were brought in tandem to Maryland. The first procedure was a Motion for Judicial Notice of Adjudicative Fact. The second procedure, presented for a binding consideration with that judicial notice taken first, was a motion for the court to revise a final decision for reasons of multi-generational extrinsic fraud upon the courts of America. It wasn't a wild request. After all, there exists precedent for American courts to take charge and actively prevent fraud.<sup>7</sup>

Finally, because all officers of the court in this case made strident and furtive efforts to conceal a fact of scientific truth for so many years (a fact that was easily able to be judicially noticed under their jurisdictional rules of evidence) these officers of the state courts (justices, judges, state attorneys, prosecutors, and law clerks) have all betrayed their spoken oaths to defend the

---

<sup>7</sup> *Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. v. Hartford-Empire Co.*, 322 U.S. at 246 (1944) "The public welfare demands that the agencies of public justice be not so impotent that they must always be mute and helpless victims of deception and fraud."

constitutions of their state and their country.<sup>8</sup> Further, their indifference to human suffering has lent aid and concealment to a brightline crime against their local neighbors, against their state neighbors, against their national neighbors, and against their international neighbors, to include the vulnerable elderly worldwide and the ever innocent children of America— children who are literally the future guardians of our far-distant “posterity” scattered wherever they roam (*Preamble* to the Constitution of the United States.) Thus, the individualized acts of fraud performed by these officers of the courts are classified as acts of intrinsic fraud— because the officers of the court concealed a pivotal fact that exposed a brightline extrinsic fraud; hence they concealed vital components of a party presentation concerning chemical lobotomy, a party presentation properly brought by procedural right during post-judgment civil litigation.

---

<sup>8</sup> The following was written in the petitions/briefs at the Supreme Court of Maryland and the Appellate Court of Maryland, and further, it was written at the top of every document in the circuit court, to include the “*Memorandum on a Constitutional Question*,” the “*Reply Memorandum of the Memoranda*,” the “*Motion for Judicial Notice of Adjudicative Fact*,” and the final motion for revisory power under the fraud clause of Rule 2-535(b.) Here it is verbatim;

**ONE CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION IN MARYLAND IS NOW  
PRESENTED TO THE PUBLIC;**

**GIVEN THAT** some previously presented clear and convincing evidence during eleven years of litigation has now been crowned since 2018 by a damnatory study that was federally funded under the NIH—

**CAN THE** fully apprised State of Maryland authorities continue to abrogate their duties under the Constitution of Maryland by concealing from public view this **fraudulent causation by the state of chemical lobotomies**, thereby nullifying justice for this petitioner during the course of a relentless set of civil procedures that sought equitable relief from the lifelong vagaries of having an involuntarily spoliated cerebrum that was executed by “the several states” under the most extreme powers of cooperative federalism?

Because this well concealed fact (QP— page 1, this petition) has axiomatic bearing on treaties with other countries, this maladministration of justice has caused a huge mess on Earth for decades.<sup>9</sup> The Constitution of the United States is proscriptive of inciting such an international mess and it prescribes who corrects the mess and how it gets corrected.<sup>10</sup> But this constitutional aspiration of correcting constitutional messes has failed catastrophically in this long series of cases brought by a single survivor who was molested by the government repeatedly, both at the very beginning of adulthood (at age 19) and at the very end of adulthood (now age 63.)

When the machine-attendants to the Constitutions of our states, and our federal one too, fail to make a constitutional correction of a mess by removing untruths, it then falls upon the people to demand a correction. As designed by the signatories, the people make the correction. Since the founding of this

---

<sup>9</sup> Petitioner’s note: this mess has caused a worldwide instigation of madness (chemical lobotomy) that precipitated mass casualty events, civil strife, and regenerative domestic misery for over 70 years until it all became institutionally entrenched as a monetized RICO-like activity that is beyond constitutional grasp and beyond reproach—and the mess is fueled illegally by a furtive concealment of eleutherian truth by those who have a constitutional obligation to speak the truth for the common good. (AKA constitutional parrhesia)

<sup>10</sup> EXTRACT from the “*Fifteen Additional Pages*” of the *Informal Petition for Writ of Certiorari* in the Supreme Court of Maryland, verbatim; — “The constitution is a circular machine that smoothes and polishes the truth by fracturing it, sending it around, agitating it, angling it against other truths, chipping the rough spots off, and making it ready for public use. Officiated truth, when finally seen, is shiny and sparkling and it is valuable for anyone who wants to hold it.

The constitution is agnostic as to the nature or source-point of the commodity truth, holding only that truth is evident and discoverable. Truth merely passes through the constitution for refinement. It goes into the constitution-machine as raw truth and it comes back out as heightened truth; purified. If the rumbling constitution-machine determines it is not the commodity called truth, it is pulled out and discarded. There are no exceptions to the act of discarding that which is not the commodity truth.”

country by those signatories, the people have historically and traditionally done that correction by using their full-sized standard American brains.<sup>11</sup> And like once or twice before, or maybe three times before, such an American correction can spill forth across the international time zones and sweep the world happily with support everywhere. Heaping helpings of goodness for everyone. Seconds are on us.

This place nevers ceases to surprise. It's why people keep sneaking into this country or keep arriving here properly after years and years of arduous application; it's a great place where great stuff happens. You watch!

Thus, there is indeed a new and simple theory of humanitarian intervention for this crime with an international scope.<sup>12</sup> The new and simple solution to this entire international mess involves educating as many people as are found living their lives in the various countries in which the United States has treaties and in which chemical lobotomy would be viewed as tyrannical activity if this hidden fact was known to the people— and if chemical lobotomy was subsequently endorsed by their respective governments after learning of the crime for the very first time in a *Judicial Notice of Adjudicative Fact*— it would be rejected by the people; rejected by the people on the checkerboarded streets.

---

<sup>11</sup> “Our Nation's history, legal traditions, and practices” in America featured in any “Glucksberg Test” when applied to the act of chemical lobotomization doesn’t include any historical record within the first 163 years affirming there was any absence of brain volume in any Americans or a record of us removing it under force of law. *Washington v. Glucksberg*, 521 U.S. 702, at 721 (1997) C.J. Rehnquist

<sup>12</sup> Once again, this petitioner recommends for this court that the old and complex theories of humanitarian intervention are best described here: Criddle, Evan J., “*Three Grotian Theories of Humanitarian Intervention*” (2015). William and Mary Law School, *Faculty Publications* # 1785. “The nation’s oldest law school.” (<https://scholarship.law.wm.edu/facpubs/1785>)

Chemical lobotomy can be ceased everywhere upon the very instant that the truth is delivered by a court with jurisdiction and delivered by a court holding a case brought by a petitioner (one with severe standing) that has asked that court to activate the mechanism of Judicial Notice of Adjudicative Fact. It's a new and simple humanitarian intervention— and no lives are lost in a civil war and there's no great expense of warfare between countries; civil mayhem ceases!

There's no costs, aside from your expense of pen and paper, if any, and an intangible cost of electronic transmission over existing government to government connections already managed by existing MLAT relationships.

## **Argument and Discussion** (“The Lock with a Hundred Keys”)

Is this court ready for Abraham Lincoln? It's about time, isn't it.

This transtemporal spectacle is as resounding as the steamy spectacle of Associate Justice Joseph Story arriving to lecture this court about equity jurisdiction during previous cases about this central grievance. Our angelic supporters from outside the constraints of time keep stepping out from their wispy “ethosphere” to voice their stern-faced hatred of chemical lobotomy.

Lincoln joins good company. Hugo Grotius still prevails as this court's transtemporal consultant on innate natural rights and their causation of international law. And who could forget the father of relief from destructive laws, Aristotle of Stagira? He has visited these cases many times to lecture on the need for equity. And remember Soren Kierkegaard when he brought forth a chunk of Baltic Amber with his admonitions about wielding reckless knives? And how about that still-sustained Judge Stapleton (onward past age 90!) as the first true

witness of the crime, a man borne on the wings of the judiciary itself?<sup>13</sup> So who arrives next in this provocation against life? Us diverse victims of the crime aren't the ones to arrive and help you escape from your mess you thrust upon us. You must use your own adjudicative brains to answer these many lurid questions posed by these many people from the exo-constitutional who have been victimized by neurotoxin overdoses. (thinking of Britney Spears yet?)

Does this court really think that Americans born under the constitutions of our country don't have an unenumerated right to retain a full sized brain?

And what about the rights of anybody found anywhere? What a mess! So it gets worse, much worse when the right to a brain is discounted to zero by multiple cooperative governments who have acted out of ignorance of this hidden, well concealed, and exported crime that is easily discoverable within their borders and then tracked back to us in America! Using neurotoxins to cause chemical lobotomy is a brightline crime against humanity. Profitably selling chemical lobotomy to governments of the world is an act of internationalized quackery by those garbing themselves as the healing saviors of society. Here's what this petitioner wrote in the informal brief at the Supreme Court of Maryland, including its internal footnote, renumbered for this petition;

**Ever since the passage of the *Pure Food and Drug Act of 1906*, such harmful quackery as showcased by this case has been implicitly illegal in America.<sup>14</sup>**

---

<sup>13</sup> . . . including his noble daughter Teryl Stapleton who sat in Sunday School classes with little five-year-old Gregory Scott Savoy at the downtown location of Second Baptist Church, Wilmington, DE (in which Mrs. Stapleton was the teacher, no less.)

<sup>14</sup> (internal footnote) *United States v. Johnson*, 221 U.S. 488 (1911) Held; the term "misbranded" and the phrase defining what amounts to misbranding in § 8 of the Food and Drugs Act of June 30, 1906, 34 Stat. 768, c. 3915, are aimed at false

— Gregory Scott Savoy, Informal Brief— ACM, at written page 11 of the 15 additional pages for case no. 0839, *In the Matter of Gregory Savoy*, Appellate Court of Maryland, 2024 term (APPENDIX E— Attachment A)

A right to keep your brain volume in one WHOLE piece is a sacrosanct human right common to all worldwide societies that thrive under a widely accepted social concept which was expressed originally in the “Golden Rule” and which was subsequently expressed in other timeless aphorisms that are implicitly related to that same Golden Rule— and in which these guiding aphorisms are found, oddly enough, practiced by word-of-mouth on the checkerboarded streets of life in both secular and non-secular countries.<sup>15</sup>

statements as to identity of the article, possibly including strength, quality and purity. (underlined emphasis by petitioner)

<sup>15</sup> The following is excerpted from footnote #4 of the “*Memorandum on a Constitutional Question*” filed on June 16, 2023 in the circuit court (case no. C-02-CV-21-001340) during this cases under review today; “To see all the worldwide formulations of the Golden Rule across a multitude of societies please reference “goldenruleproject.org” and click on the menu bars located at the upper right. This drop down menu will reveal an option for “Formulations.” And excerpted at page 7 of the same *Memorandum on a Constitutional Question* can be found the following entire entry VERBATIM;

“The very essence of civil liberty certainly consists in the right of every individual to claim the protection of the laws whenever he receives an injury.”

—writing at 163, John Marshall, majority opinion, *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. 137 (1803)

Injury? The word “injury” hardly describes it. Retention of your private brain matter is a sacrosanct natural right under blackletter law (Jeffrey Dahmer was prosecuted for murders in Wisconsin for his similar attempts to partially lobotomize his live victims by pouring acid and boiling water into holes he drilled while they were immobilized and awake; depraved indifference;) a sacrosanct natural right under the Common Law of England (vide the basis for law in Maryland; Article 5, Declaration of Rights, Constitution of Maryland,) a sacrosanct natural right under Customary International Law [vide CIL practiced by the OTP at the ICC, “Rome Statute,” Article 7, 1. (k)] and it is a sacrosanct natural right under all of the unquestioned social extensions derived for two

Further, when chemical lobotomy is officiated in America as an extralegal activity without any trial held or without any accusation of a crime by any prosecutor, it becomes cruel and unusual punishment and has become starkly in America (and other allegedly “developed” countries) a legally enforced punishment for no crime committed! (violative of both 8th Amdt. & 5th Amdt.)

It is a wretched and repugnant activity and it is a spectacle of government maladministration. Any American chemically lobotomized is instantly due equitable relief directly from this country’s constitutions that were originally ensconced in the Common Law, requiring no “magic words” to be spoken before delivery of justice. How fast we fell. The basic maxims of equity were known just a short while ago when it was explained in a Maryland court that equity will not allow a statute to be used as a cloak for fraud:

“Courts of equity, independently of any statute, will relieve against fraud, if proceedings are seasonably brought after its discovery. Indeed, to use the language of Lord Cottenham, a court of equity will wrest property fraudulently acquired, not only from the perpetrator of the fraud, but ‘from his children and his children’s children,’ or, as was said in another English case, ‘from any person to whom he may have parcelled out the fruits of his fraud.’”

— *Citizens Bank v. Leffler*, 228 Md. 262, 269 (Md. 1962)

By design, these American constitutions (state and federal) were mutually bound to these victims of chemical lobotomy as predicates for living with unquestioned liberty and living without tyrannical governance, yet neither exist

---

thousand years from the biblical “Ten Commandments,” if not the unquestioned social extensions derived from similar behavioral guideposts found in other predominant human religions scattered across the world, bar none (“the thread that weaves us all together,” please reference again the expansive common history of human ethics found at “goldenruleproject.org,” supra, footnote #4 )”

END VERBATIM

for these victims secretly removed by violent force from the united American constitutions— and this is not a new idea at all;

**“Besides, there are certain parts of the state constitutions which are so interwoven with the federal constitution that a violent blow cannot be given to the one without communicating the wound to the other.”**

--James Madison (writing under the collective pseudonym of “Publius”,) *The Federalist Papers No. 43*, page 272-273, Signet Classics, Copyright Penguin Group (USA) Inc., 1961

Me and my people are truly exo-constitutional and our realm is as “real” as the extreme legalities written on paper that formed it, as “real” as the physical and chemical restraints that are employed against our liberty, and as “real” as these neurotoxins (formerly sold worldwide as insecticide in the 1930’s) that are forcibly pumped into our bloodstream to reach our brains and destroy our entire lives beyond repair. Just go ask Britney. Will you just go ask Britney?<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Well, well, well; the federal intransigence gets worse, much worse, doesn’t it? The Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group of the U.S. House of Representatives was requested by this petitioner on February 6th, 2023 to hold a hearing with alacrity on behalf of the exo-constitutional realm in which Britney Spears could testify and vindicate herself to the world and concur in public along with Gregory Scott Savoy and Attorney Jim Gottstein (founder of psychrights.org and a member of the exo-constitutional realm) — concurring that it’s all been a multi-tentacled fraud on the courts– and such testimony never happened at Congress! Meanwhile, Dr. Martin Harrow, “The Galileo of Modern Psychiatry,” passed away on February 21, 2023 and the public will never hear about the results of his heroic lifelong labors on behalf of the exo-constitutional realm or about his international chess victories as he is introduced to speak to the committee and to the public; let alone see this polymath stand up in a federal press conference to explain the crime; as was requested in 2015 at this court; written page 28, *Pet. for Writ Mand. & Eq. Relief, In Re Gregory Scott Savoy*, case no. 15-5054, Supreme Court of the United States. And back then there’s the following predictive words found at page 31 of that same document in discussing the execution of Scott Panetti; “If Scott is executed without the revised truth about neuroleptic medicines being considered by this court as highly adjudicative facts, then none of us have a prayer.” (NOTE: above underlined emphasis added TODAY by this petitioner— a petitioner who now holds another request for a *Judicial Notice for Adjudicative Facts* nine outrageous years later! And what of Coonce?)

The two law procedures properly raised under the rules were denied in the lower courts and the follow-on equitable relief under common law was never once contemplated by any officer of the court in Maryland.

**“ . . . the fruits of life do not neatly lend themselves to the niceties of constitutionalism; but neither does the Constitution tolerate any result, however distorted, just because it is the product of a convenient mathematical formula which, in most situations, may produce a tolerable product.”**

— Supreme Court of the United States,  
*Norfolk & W.R. Co. v. Missouri State Tax*  
*Comm’n* 390 U.S. 317 (1968)

Is state taxation of the chemically lobotomized “the fruits of life that do not neatly lend themselves to the niceties of constitutionalism?” Or how about the respondent’s “convenient mathematical formulas which, in most situations, may produce a tolerable product?” Absurdly, it really doesn’t take much to provide simple equitable relief to the walking and talking victims of chemical lobotomy— just listen to them— if they are not interrupted incessantly by judges who defend the crime by ignoring the crime— listen to what happens when any one of us survivors of this fraud asks for even the very simplest of human relief, a relief not even involving any of your glorified government money at all;

**THE COURT** I believe their allegation is that you didn’t pay taxes.

**MR. SAVOY:** No.

**THE COURT:** And in its simplest —

**MR. SAVOY:** I think the allegation is that —

**THE COURT:** — In its simplest form —

**MR. SAVOY:** — I was damaged beyond repair. I managed to scrape along, and I still have nothing more than what I had when I was 22 years old.

**THE COURT:** — So, sir, what is it you’re asking this court to do?

MR. SAVOY: — To leave me alone. Everybody, to leave me alone. Let me live my life.

THE COURT: So when you earned money, W-9's, whatever you're doing at the present — I assume you're still working within your field?

MR. SAVOY: — Yes.

THE COURT: Okay, so what you're asking is that you be excused from paying taxes.

MR. SAVOY: Not excused, because under equity — equity can't destroy law— as we know.

THE COURT: No, no, no.

MR. SAVOY: We can't change the law decision, but equity can provide clean-up equity.

THE COURT: So what you're asking is that you be treated differently than the other citizens in the state.

MR. SAVOY: No; I'm asking that you treat me the same way you treat people (“who’ve had their brains shrunk” – *this is a disambiguation by this petitioner—the original speaker—in order to reconcile an error by the transcript preparer.*) And that if you make a judicial notice of adjudicated (*sic*) fact, it would go a long ways to helping the public understand what's happened here.

—Oral Argument by Gregory Scott Savoy; pages 31 to 32 of the transcript from the hearing of September 18, 2023, case no. C-02-CV-21-001340, Circuit Court of Anne Arundel County.

So now let's let Lincoln do his work (I'm aware it's been a mighty long introduction in classic Savoy style with that shrunken brain.) But if you're not sitting already, though, you might want to sit down for this one from Lincoln.

During Abraham Lincoln's time nobody had yet dreamed up the crime of chemical lobotomy. They did in Lincoln's time, however, dream up a legal way to consider slaves as holding three-fifths value on voting day, as if the constitution even allowed slavery of people under the law of nations — “allowed” just because they're originally from some arbitrary foreign lands (cradle of civilisation) in which one genetic factor (skin coloration) had arbitrarily remained unchanged compared to the outliers who scurried off to other less hospitable lands. But

whether you are considering this second crime of chemical lobotomy or whether you are considering the first crime of slavery, Lincoln's words now seem like a direct prophecy predicting present times. (vide #2 of Denied Facts, page 11, this petition)

It is prophecy of the highest pedigree, especially now that facts from the National Library of Medicine prove that African-Americans in these present times have been disproportionately destroyed by chemical lobotomy upon being trapped by involuntary psychiatric detentions behind legally locked psych ward doors, all enforced by streamlined American court authority;

**“ . . . One after another they have closed the heavy iron doors upon him, and now they have him, as it were, bolted in with a lock of a hundred keys, which can never be unlocked without the concurrence of every key; the keys in the hands of a hundred different men, and they scattered to a hundred different and distant places; and they stand musing as to what invention, in all the dominions of mind and matter, can be produced to make the impossibility of his escape more complete than it is.”**

— Abraham Lincoln's Speech (on the Dred Scott Decision) given June 26, 1857, Springfield, Illinois as recorded in the Illinois State Journal of June 29, 1857 (for purposes of maintaining this accurate testimony, the above quote and attribution were taken from *Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln, Vol. 2*, University of Michigan Digital Library Production Services, 2001, by permission for educational use from the original print source; *“Collected Works,” Abraham Lincoln Association, Springfield, Illinois*, Rutgers University Press, Brunswick, New Jersey, 1953 (emphasis added)

Well look, the predictive musings mentioned above by Lincoln stopped being musings in the 1950's when an “invention, in all the dominions of mind and matter” (*Lincoln*, supra) was tragically located in the hangouts of unprincipled chemists. They stopped being musings by Lincoln and they became

the new crime under the same moniker. This brand new “lock with a hundred keys” happened when DuPont could no longer market their leading insecticide, phenothiazine. In the 1930’s it was DuPont’s best seller worldwide. The neurotoxin phenothiazine became unmarketable because DDT came along in the 1940’s as a superior neurotoxin.

But neurotoxins are neurotoxins, regardless of their kill-rate for insects, and U.S. public health officials of the 1950’s saw no problem with the chemist’s work when unprincipled chemists worked up an “invention, in all the dominions of mind and matter” (*Lincoln*, supra) that would rescue all of that stockpiled phenothiazine sitting around. This is the same broken generation of public health officials who gave us the repugnant Tuskegee Syphilis Study, ethically deficient individuals who harbored the myths of racism as much as the myths of mental illness— and who had contempt for the natural rights of their neighbor, regardless of the borders between countries and regardless that those borders can never forestall the aphorisms that are spoken on the checkerboarded streets of life. (e.g., *The Golden Rule*) The public never found out the truth about antipsychotics, which is actually the neurotoxin phenothiazine (it’s phenothiazine for both the typical antipsychotics and the atypical antipsychotics— vide Exhibit #1, which is ONLY corroborated to exist at Appendix D of this petition, but for the circuit court’s concealment and denial of facts.)

It was quackery from the start. A neurotoxin was profitably peddled as a cure-all. Brain destruction was sold as recovery! And the false confirmation bias ran wild within governments. When judges saw a defendant ranting wildly about some grievance, either a real grievance or an imagined grievance, the new and

easy solution was a fast involuntary commitment with its secret attendant crime of chemical lobotomy performed behind locked doors; the “lock with a 100 keys!” When they next showed up in court three months later everybody was happy with the lobotomized zombie sitting at the table, a zombie who was easily cajoled by the state prosecutors and their defense counsel, cajoled into nodding his or her head in the proper direction for the agreed legal result under an ignored constitution. For judges, it’s tough words to hear. Here’s what happened at the circuit court in Maryland when these tough words were spoken;

MR. SAVOY: I disagree. Can I — can I give — can I give you an argument why —

THE COURT: Yes; please.

MR. SAVOY: — you should perhaps —

THE COURT: Oh, I’m not allowed to violate the law and expand my authority.

MR. SAVOY: That’s correct. That’s correct, and I’m trying to save —

THE COURT: I’m not allowed to —

MR. SAVOY: — I’m trying to save this court from being involved in —

THE COURT: I’m not allowed to expand my authority —

MR. SAVOY: — Fraud.

THE COURT: Well, sir, every time you use that, just so that you know —

MR. SAVOY: Yes?

THE COURT:---I am personally — I take that as a personal affront.

MR. SAVOY: I didn’t — I didn’t say it to you. I said ‘the court’.

THE COURT: You certainly did; you said ‘the court’. I am the court for purposes of your argument.

MR. SAVOY: Okay. And what I said was, I’m trying to save the court from going down that road of involving themselves in fraud.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. SAVOY: Chemical lobotomy is against the rule of God. It’s against everything we hold as a country. It’s why we’re all — it’s why these people came here today.

THE COURT: Do not talk about the other case, please.

MR. SAVOY: I won’t. These people, anybody who would come in — the last time I was here with you, there were assorted people in the room? They were lucky enough to learn something

that could actually save the family member who is about to get the chemical lobotomy.

This is a — an issue that's not to be taken lightly. Yet the court, the other table, takes it very lightly. It's called abuse of discretion. I know it's a standard of appellate review, but originally, it was actually words that meant something to people in the community who got together and created all of this.

Law and equity —

—Oral Argument by Gregory Scott Savoy; pages 5 to 7 of transcript from hearing of September 18, 2023, case no. C-02-CV-21-001340, Cir. Court of A.A. Cnty.

Let's go down the list of proven concealers. Federal public health officials have seen no crime against humanity in sustaining a public policy that delivers chemical lobotomy. Federal prosecutors of both political parties and federal attorneys general of both political parties see no crime against humanity in sustaining a public policy that delivers chemical lobotomy. And now, as if it couldn't get worse, state ALJs, state judges and state justices are proven to see no crime against humanity in sustaining a public policy that delivers chemical lobotomy. These officers of the state courts are the closest to the people on the checkerboarded streets of America, the people who live by aphorisms— yet they don't hear the people from the streets of the states, especially us lobotomized ones. Dismissed!

I know what happened to me and I know who did it and know who allowed it to happen and I know who further concealed that crime after it was reported by me. Before my chemical lobotomy, the federal facts sworn under penalty of perjury prove I was an accomplished musician with a bright future in music, if just playing music on the weekends as a hobby like many of the others. No more ever again; no music ever performed ever, not anywhere, not on

weekends and not otherwise. My ability to keep metronomic time was destroyed in the most vital years of a musician's life, early twenties. Across the subsequent thirty years, the destruction rippled across everything I grasped as a means to escape this theft of brain matter, to include theft of public service from Gregory Scott Savoy when the Delaware Gun Law Notice (Exh. #6, APPENDIX D) kept me out of the U.S. military by law and removed any follow-on educational benefits delivered by law. And after those thirty years of trying to survive with that hobbled brain, the subsequent ten years have proven that the constitutional right to petition the government about this crime just leads to public snickers, defamations delivered by the courts themselves, and bigoted judicial acts by those entrusted to discern the constitutions for the public good (and ejecting most nearly all of the *The Bill of Rights* to lend support to chemical lobotomy.)

Going further down the list; the axiomatic crime was reported to the FBI, reported to the DOJ, and reported to the bicameral judiciary committees of Congress, and to various Inspector Generals, to the state prosecutors, to the state attorney general, and to any single lawyer encountered along the way that is sworn to defend the constitutions if, and when, they are in the employ of a state government, such as the first to receive this report in the State of Maryland— an unmoved administrative law judge (ALJ) in the summer of 2018.<sup>17</sup> Before that, in 2016 and 2017, it was also reported to the U.S. Judicial Conference under proper procedure for judicial complaint and in 2023 it was reported to the Bipartisan

---

<sup>17</sup> That ALJ received a copy of case no. 18-8407 which featured the Pittsburgh study. In that case at the Supreme Court of the United States, the “question presented” on the second page said it all! Then the repugnancy was subsequently explained in a telephonic hearing with that ALJ. His active concealment of the crime commenced, despite being informed it would be concealment.

Legal Advisory Group of the U.S. House of Representatives, reported by journalist Gregory Scott Savoy who has been credentialed under Congress for 27 years.

All individuals, without consulting or informing the greater public, determined that chemical lobotomy, come hell or high water, will continue as a criminal practice on Earth. It must be that their one-given brain is good for them and it must be that they believe they are smart enough or privileged enough to fight off the primordial crime if it suddenly ricochets back in their direction. Yes, they always think they're special till that 20 percent of brain volume is burned out of their skull by a proven neurotoxin (insecticide) during those first 72 hours of an involuntary commitment<sup>18</sup>

As we run further down the list of the intransigent perpetrators, we finally get to the unresponsive political parties that have monetized every facet of American life (pillows to pot.) Let's make a simple test and ask one question; should the people of the exo-constitutional realm expect a rescue from either political party? First of all, one party passed a national health care bill that institutionalized antipsychotics into law for "all epochs and times" and nary a single member from the opposing party participated in the passage of that ACA.

---

<sup>18</sup> or, what's more likely in future times not far off, is a tyrannical government's devious commandment during a future public emergency to do an easy act, a seemingly proper commandment to drink the apportioned amount of that tasty "milk-plus" delivered everywhere and provided free of charge by some suddenly contrite nation-state formerly hostile to America! (and with "quinine sulfate added as a taste mask" to the milk-plus so it's true neurotoxic composition is undiscovered; so on taste masks please see the final listing under item #1 of the "Table of Denied Adjudicative Facts," at page 10 of this petition.) Once the entire population is swiftly chemically lobotomized there will be no recovery of society; all gone in one generation; no more. Did the national security lightbulb for you just light up? How about the global governance lightbulb?

So do my members of the exo-constitutional realm run to that opposing party? Not so fast— it's time for my people to hold the imaginary line. The opposing party has no love for us either. And don't confuse a victim of this crime with those who are not a victim of the most heinous crime ever devised on Earth. Those who are not a victim of the most heinous crime ever devised on Earth are the ones most likely to accede to the flourishing of this crime under their own private ignorance or stupidity, peddling defamatory falsehoods and jazz-handing nasty tropes upon my people in the style of divine revelation;

“Because we have millions and millions of people and they came from prisons and jails. They came from mental institutions, and [were] insane. So they're not the same thing. An insane asylum is a mental institution on steroids. It's *Silence of the Lambs*. Okay, you know that Hannibal Lecter? They're all being deposited into our country,” he claimed

— Online Headline: “Trump Compares migrants to Hannibal Lecter as he says they are coming from ‘insane asylums,’” by Gustaf Kilander Washington DC, Katie Hawkinson, February 24, 2024, The Independent, (<https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/us-politics/donald-trump-hannibal-lecter-migrants-b2502015.html>)

According to our prospective leaders, my people are all just toothy killers like Hannibal Lecter (a fictional movie character!) No wonder nobody loves us in society. No wonder nobody will ever let us just live our lives. And by the way, could “ya please” stop confiscating our brain volume!

Neither party cares to break from the wildly profitable myth of mental illness, especially if fearful voters can be snookered by fraudulent claims on the campaign trail (by republicans) and especially if health care fraud can be monetized in a nationalized scheme where three generations of lunatics will

never be enough, not when money is getting spread around within fake rehabilitation programs run by a “progressive” government (democrats.)<sup>19</sup>

No Solicitor General of the United States has ever issued a *Confession of Error* about the fraud of chemical lobotomy. Both political parties in America have embraced the fraud. All courts in America have embraced the fraud. All prosecutors and officers of the courts in America have embraced the fraud.

“There is but one thing of real value - to cultivate truth and justice, and to live without anger in the midst of lying and unjust men.”

— Roman Emperor Marcus Aurelius, Book VI, Number 47, *Meditations*, Born April 26, 121 AD, Died March 17 180 AD; (Aurelius was also known as “the philosopher on the Emperor’s throne”)

---

<sup>19</sup> Chemical lobotomy is forced government surgery by hidden means. Has this court ever spoken about a government using forced surgery as a policy? Yes it has, unfortunately. It was Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr. in the opinion for *Buck v. Bell*, 274 U.S. 200 (1927) who wrote the following bigoted words “Three generations of imbeciles are enough.” So now consider once again an instructive book that was raised previously with the same exact Maryland parties of this instant case in a previous proceeding at the USDC for the EDVA–Alexandria division, raised in a diversity jurisdiction case (Savoy III.) The following book by Paul Lombardo was raised during this petitioner’s objections to their motions to dismiss; “*Three generations, no imbeciles: Eugenics, the Supreme Court, and Buck v. Bell.*” Johns Hopkins University Press., P.A. (2008.) Here’s a published note about Paul’s book from the publisher; “*Few lines from U.S. Supreme Court opinions are as memorable as this declaration by Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr. in the landmark 1927 case Buck v. Bell. The ruling allowed states to forcibly sterilize residents in order to prevent “feebleminded and socially inadequate” people from having children. It is the only time the Supreme Court endorsed surgery as a tool of government policy. Though Buck set the stage for more than sixty thousand involuntary sterilizations in the United States and was cited at the Nuremberg trials in defense of Nazi sterilization experiments, it has never been overturned.*”

## Truth and Equitable Relief ("The Almanac Case")

But despite all that elite endorsement of these mental health falsehoods revealed herein this document, the plainly written words of the constitution reveal it is still this court's duty to say what the constitution says about the axiomatic crime of chemical lobotomy when treaties are ensnared into that crime. To fulfill that duty, the wisest mechanism to activate is the Judicial Notice of Adjudicative Fact. And in setting his early example of the Golden Rule for our nation by returning a good deed for one given to him, the transtemporal Lincoln utters flatly; "activate the mechanism."

**"MOST people have never heard about the 1858 murder trial of William "Duff" Armstrong. But everyone knows Armstrong's defense attorney: Abraham Lincoln. Before he was elected the Sixteenth President of the United States, Lincoln had struggled to make a name for himself. As he told the jury, Mrs. Armstrong--the widowed mother of his client--had shown him kindness, providing shelter and clothes when he had none. Seeking to reciprocate the generosity when her boy found himself in some trouble, Lincoln volunteered for her son's defense without a fee.**

**Armstrong was charged with murder in the first degree. Prosecutors alleged that on the night of August 29, 1857, Armstrong beat James Metzger so severely that he died the next day. A fellow by the name of Allen, witness for the prosecution, testified that he witnessed the blow. How? By the light of the full moon. It was 10 o'clock p.m., he testified, and the moon shined brightly. The court adjourned for the day.**

**That night, Lincoln went to a corner drug store in Beardstown, Illinois, and purchased an almanac. The next day, he was prepared. The moon on that night, the almanac showed, did not shine until several hours after 10 p.m. The court took judicial notice. Shortly thereafter, the jury acquitted Armstrong.**

**The reason for telling the story of the "Almanac Trial" is two-fold. The first is that judicial notice is valuable. Without it, Lincoln would have had to lay a foundation for introduction of testimonial evidence showing that the moon did not shine at the time Allen said, cross-examine Allen to impeach the witness or in**

**the hopes he recanted, or offer documentary evidence and have it authenticated.”**

–By: Michael C. Zogby and Daniel A. Dorfman, "Judicial Notice: An Underappreciated and Misapplied Tool of Efficiency.." The Free Library. 2017 International Association of Defense Counsels, downloaded Aug. 14, 2023 <sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Lincoln’s instructive entry about judicial notice is also found at written-page 10 of the *Motion for Judicial Notice of Adjudicative Fact* filed on August 17, 2023 in the circuit court one month before the hearing of September 18 that featured oral argument in support of that motion. However, at that hearing the following odd thing happened toward the end of that tedious and exhausting hearing;

**THE COURT:** Sir why don’t you just go ahead and tell me what you want to tell me, then.

**MR.SAVOY:** I’m seeking a motion- to have granted a Motion for Judicial Notice of Adjudicative Fact.

**THE COURT:** Okay; since we don’t have a motion called that, what is it that you’re asking, in plain speak, that the court knows.

**MR. SAVOY:** Actually, you do have a judicial notice of adjudicated (sic) —

**THE COURT:** Sir, I’m asking you, what are you asking the court?

**MR. SAVOY:** Similar to how Abraham Lincoln used the almanac in The Almanac Case, which I cite in this motion —

**THE COURT:** Uh-huh . . .

**MR. SAVOY:** That instead of me having to prove this fraud activity — I’m sorry that it’s the word ‘fraud’, but it’s the word applicable to the activity. In order to prove that, I would have to call to the — I would have to call a witness named — I’ll go down the list; I know them all. I’d have to call Dr. Martin Harrow who started the first study of my population, and he died a couple months ago, so he’s not around anymore. But I could call Dr. Wunderink from the Netherlands. That would cost me quite a bit. And Dr. David Healy from Britain. They could testify here to say, ‘Yes, we’ve been trying to get this through for years. We’ve been trying to get this through the United Nations; we’ve been trying to get everybody to look at this. And that a single individual would arrive to do this for you, is what everybody’s been waiting to have happen.

**THE COURT:** Trying to get ‘this’ — what is ‘this’? Define ‘this’ for me.

(at page 26 to 27 of transcript from hearing of September 18, 2023, case no. C-02-CV-21-001340, Circuit Court of Anne Arundel County)

## Conclusion


**“More than a tacit sentence or the standard hat-tip is warranted here. The coordinated projects and lifeworks of a worldwide multi-generational host of agents and messengers has converged right here at the U.S. Supreme Court for your consideration today, with perhaps a small flutter in your chest added as proof of the rareness of such a thing, and so, after catching your breath, your response should reflect your understanding of God’s presence in all of this interconnecting activity on behalf of liberty.”**

— a previous conclusion by Gregory Scott Savoy— found at written page 53, *Pet. for Writ Mand. & Eq. Relief*, “In Re Gregory Scott Savoy,” case no. 15-5054, Supreme Court of the United States (2015)

The petition for writ of certiorari should be granted and a response from the Solicitor General of the United States compelled by polite invitation.

Truthfully submitted by Gregory Scott Savoy under penalty of perjury on September 28, 2024,

Gregory Scott Savoy  
Pro Se, In Forma Pauperis  
DBA Greg Savoy

A large, stylized handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'G. Savoy', written over the typed name and title.

Contact: 703-402-8139  
EagleScoutWriter@gmail.com  
(greg.savoy@thomsonreuters.com)

P.O. Box 101  
Herndon, VA 20172