

No. 24-6184

FILED

OCT 14 2024

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Lisa Washington PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.
Joseph Lee Washington RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Lisa Washington
(Your Name)

2342 Ska Huck Ave
(Address)

Berkeley CA 94702
(City, State, Zip Code)

541 510 427-2994
(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

Does a United States citizen have to give up their right under the XIV Amendment section 1. privileges of life, liberty, or property, without due process of the law and the equal protection of the law, due to misconduct of court officials?

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

Lisa Washington vs. Joseph Lee Washington, RP20083718
Alameda County Superior Probate Court California Judgment entered
on June 17, 2022

Lisa Washington vs. Joseph Washington A166079, First
Appellate District Division FOUR Judgment entered

Lisa Washington vs. Joseph Washington RP20083718
Alameda County Superior Probate Court Judgment entered
July 10, 2023

~~Lisa Washington~~ vs Joseph Lee Washington A168483
Appellant District Division Four Judgment

over →

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION.....	
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	
CONCLUSION.....	

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	<i>In The court of Appeal of the state of California</i>
APPENDIX B	<i>First Appellate Distict Division four Memorandum</i>
APPENDIX C	<i>Alameda County Superior Probate court</i>
APPENDIX D	<i>In The supreme court of California</i>
APPENDIX E	
APPENDIX F	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

United States v Turlette, 452, US 576, 583. 11981

STATUTES AND RULES

<i>18 U.S.C 1962 c Racketeering</i>	<i>30, 34, 51</i>
<i>18 U.S.C 1962 d Conspiracy</i>	<i>34, 47</i>
<i>18 U.S.C 1958 murder for hire</i>	
<i>18 U.S.C 1343 wire fraud</i>	<i>40, 48</i>
<i>18 U.S code chapter 73 obstruction of justice</i>	
<i>Amendment XIV section 1</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>California Pen code section 132 and 134</i>	<i>3, 4</i>
<i>California Probate code 8852</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>California Probate code 8901</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>California code 604</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>California code of civil procedure section 916</i>	<i>22</i>

OTHER

<i>60 minutes April 20, 2024 Report</i>	
<i>titled the havana syndrom</i>	<i>34</i>

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 _____ to the petition and is

- ☐ reported at _____; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

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

- ☐ reported at _____; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

☒ For cases from **state courts**:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix _____ 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 Alameda County Superior Court court appears at Appendix A to the petition and is

- ☐ reported at _____; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☒ is unpublished.

JURISDICTION

☐ For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was _____.

☐ 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: July 16, 2024, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix B.

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

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

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Amendment XIV section 1

18 U.S.C 1962 (c) Racketeering

18 U.S.C 1962 (d) Conspiracy

18 U.S.C 1958 Murder for hire scheme

18 U.S.C 1343 Wire Fraud

18 U.S code chapter 73 Obstruction of Justice

18 U.S. & 1951 interference with commerce

The hobbs Act' prohibits actual or attempted robbery or extortion affecting interstate or foreign commerce in any way or degree also proscribes conspiracy to commit robbery or extortion without reference to conspiracy

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This case is regarding the estate of Sarah A. Daniels. The eviden will show that Alameda County Superior Probate court along with other court officials are conducting an racketeering scheme to defraud the estate of Sarah A. Daniels and others, though a pattern of organized crime and behaviors.

Sarah A. Daniels D.OB was 11/20/2020. Petitioner was decedent niece.

The decedent had no children. Decedent had three Pre decedent brothers, Joseph Washington, Sam Washington, and Paul Thompson.

Joseph Lee Washington, is decedent nephew.

Mathew Alden is Joseph Lee Washington
a Horney. Joseph Lee Washington is the administer
of the estate.

Sarah A. Daniels had two Jackson life insurnes
Policys. The benafivary of the policys was
Joseph Washington the administer father.

The Jackson life insurnes policys included
the real Property that is located at 6000 moris
dr. Oakland ca.

Joseph Lee Washington went to the funeral
home with the policys. The director of the funeral
home took the policys from Josh Lee Washington
and told him that he was not the beneficiary.

Mr. Mathew Alden, Joseph Lee Washington, along

along with Alameda County Probate Judge Sandra K. Bean came up with a deliberate scheme to defraud the estate and Jackson Life Insurance Company.

The Scheme is U.S.C 1349, 18 USC 1962(d) 18 U.S.C 1951(a)

On or about 1/25/2021, Matthew Alden submitted two fraudulent petitions for administrator. Joseph Washington was one and the other was James Washington. CT 23 vol 1 32, 52

Joseph Washington has been dead since 2007 and there is no James Washington in are family.

California Penal code section 132 and 134

offering forged fraudulent attested or dated evidence. This means that the person who prepared

or offered false evidence knew that it was and had the purpose to deceive the court.

On or about, 2/1/21, Mathew Alden submitted a Petition for administrator for Joseph Lee Washington.

On or about, 5/3/21, Judge Sandra K. Bean order Joseph Lee Washington the Personal representative of the estate.

On or about 2/2/21, Judge Sandra K. Bean order Joseph Washington the Personal representative of the estate.

To further the scheme, Mathew Alden mail out notices to wrong address to beneficiaries.

The examiner update notes dated 4/30/21 states on page 5 line 1 address for Naomi Washington is listed as unknown. Please file declaration of due Diligence.

Nancy Thompson, address list as unknown.
On line three Paul Thompson Jr. name was listed twice.

On line four Karah Jackson, no city and state listed after street address

Under 39 (2) is marked which states that the petitioner is a nominee of a person entitled to a letter. No nomination letter was attached to the Petition.

On page six of the examiner notes 4/30/21, under service of notices the examiner stated 1. in the notice of Kathy Washington, Lisa Washington and Naomi Washington mailing address is listed at 4508 Laura way, Union cy 94587.

However, in the petition for probate, their addresses

is listed as 4717 Laura way, Union City ca 94117. Please address

Under Court review, on page 6 notice mail on 3/30/21, filed on 4/6/21 on proof of service no signature for person who mailed the notice.

Therefore, on or about 12/2021, Judge Sandra K. Bean appointed Lonnie S. Dilard as referee.

On or about 12/16/21, Matthew Alden submitted an inventory and appraisal form to the court which estimated the value of the real property located at 6000 moise dr. Oakland ca. at \$ 725,000 and Personal property at \$17,000.00 et pg 3 vol 1

Matthew Alden didn't list the Jackson life insurance policies or bank accounts and the land she owned out of state.

Under Ca Probate code 8901 - the representative must apprais money, cash items, checking accounts, tax refunds, cars, medical refunds personal items of value with detail.

California Probate code 8852

The personal representative shall take and subscribe an oath that the inventory contains a true statement of the property to be administered in the decedent's estate. of which the personal representative has knowledge and particularly of money of the decedent and debts or demands of the decedent against the personal representative.

The oath shall be enclosed upon or attached to the inventory list.

Further, on or about, 11/20/2021, Lonnie S. Dilard appraised the real property located at 6000 mors dr. at \$ 7000.⁰⁰

On or about, 2/08/2022, Appellant petition the court to remove Joseph Lee Washington as the personal representative.

On or about 4/22/2022, Lonnie S. Dilard on her own merits went back to the real property and reappraised the property. at \$ 615,000.⁰⁰
CT 188, 189, 190 Vol 1 Vol 2 329 18 U.S.C 1962 (d) 18 U.S.C 195(a)

Lonnie S. Dilard, submitted the new appraisal to the court. 18 U.S.C 1349

Judge Sandra K. Bean, didn't have a hearing on the new appraisal. Judge Bean, just replaced the appraisal done four months earlier with the appraisal done on 4/22/2022. 18 U.S.C 1962 (d) 18 U.S.C 1962 (C), 18 U.S code chapter 73 obstruction of Justice.

On or about 2/2022, Petitioner went over to the probate court to see what was going on.

Petitioner, talked with a clerk by the name of Joy. Appellant asked Joy for a copy of the file. Joy stated that she couldn't give her anything from the file. U.S Code 73 obstruction of Justice

Petitioner, went back to the court two weeks later and talked with a nother clerk. The clerk gave ~~petitioner~~ a copy of the examiner notes.

On or about, 3/9/2022, Petitioner filed objection of the sale of the real property.

On or about 3/9/2022, Mathew Alden filed a motion to strike Petition to Objection of sale of real property. Filed for Joseph Lee Washington.

On or about, 3/21/2022, Mathew Alden, filed a report of sale and Petition for order confirming sale of real Property filed for Joseph Lee Washington.

The report of sale and Petition for order had Joseph Washington name signed on both documents. 18 U.S.C 1962(d) 18 U.S.C 1951(a) 18 U.S.C 1349

On or about, 4/13/2022, there was a hearing on the sell of the real Property. Judge Sandra K. Bean denied the sell of the real property. The Judge wanted Century 21 Real estate agent Janet Haliburton and her partner Stan from Legacy real estate to explain to petitioner why they priced the property so low. 18 U.S.C 1962(d)

Petitioner, went back to the court clerk and explained to her what was going on. The clerk, told petitioner, that she was not the only

One complaining about the court taking real property from estates. The clerk went on to say, Petitioner should contact head Clerk of Alameda County, Superior court, Chad Finkey. He would get to the bottom of it. 18 USC 1962 (C) 18 U.S.C 1962 (d)

On or about, May 4, 2022, there was a hearing on the petition to remove the personal representative.

Judge Sandra Bean. would not let petitioner speak at the hearing. U.S code 73 obstruction of Justice

On or about, May 26, 2022, petitioner filed a Peremptory challenge as to Sandra K. Bean. Judge Sandra K. Bean denied the challenge. ET Pg 310

On or about, May 24, 2022, Mathew Alden amended report to sale and petition for order confirming sale of real property.

Joseph Washington was still the petitioner of the sell of the property.

Amendment XIV section 1. All person born or naturalized in the United States. all subjects to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and the state where in they reside. No state shall make or enforce law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of the law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the law.

On or about, June 17, 2022. there was a hearing in department 202. with Judge Sarka K. Bean presiding. The hearing was regarding the sell of the real property.

The court asked Mr. Alden are there any liquid assets in the estate. CTPG 28

Mathew Alden: I believe there a bank account your honor that... and I forgot how much money it has in it, maybe like 8 or 10,000.00 or something CTPG 12 line 1-3

Judge Sandra K. Bean, premitted the sell of the real property.

On or about, July 1, 2022, Judge Sandra K. Bean signed the order from the hearing on June 17, 2022.

On or about, 8/16/2022, petitioner filed a notice of appeal and Designation of Record.

Alameda County superior appeals clerk sent Petitioner two volumes 1 thru 416 and a copy of the transcripts from the June 17, 2022 hearing.

This was the first time petitioner had access to the hole record on file.

The Cover up

What ensued after petitioner filed her first appeal, in the court of Appeal, of the of the state of California, First Appellate District, Division four, undermine democracy, freedoms of due process of the law, and the rights of United State citizen to exercises their rights to persure life, liberty and happyness with the equal protection of the law. in violation of 18 U.S.C 1962 (d), 18 U.S.C 1962 (c) U.S code 73 obstruction of Justice

On or about, 12/19/22, petitioner filed her opening brife with divition four clerk channing Hoo. Channing Hoo, stamped the brife and stated he would scan the brife into the computer.

Petitioner, a week later looked at the docket on line. The docket stated that petitioner missed the due date for filins her brife.

Petitioner went over to the appeals court, and asked channing Hoo, what happen to her brife,

that was filed on 12/19/2022. Channing Hoo stated he didn't get the brief. Petitioner went into her back pak and pulled out the copy Mr. Channing Hoo stamped. Channing Hoo stated he would go look for the brief. 18 U.S.C 1349, 18 U.S.C 1962 (d) U.S code 73 obstruction of Justice

When Channing Hoo came back, he had petitioner brief which was all crumbled up. Mr. Channing Hoo, stated, he would scan it into the computer.

On or about, 2/14/2023, petitioner was required to file a fee waiver.

Petitioner, filed the fee waiver with the clerk. The clerk stated, she would submitte the waiver to Channing Hoo.

Petitioner, a week later received a letter from the clerk of the court, dismissing her appeal, due to petitioner, not filing a fee waiver.

Petitioner, wrote a letter to the clerk of the court, with attached to the letter a copy of the court stamped fee waiver. The clerk reinstated the case.

On or about, 5/10/2023, Channing Hoo, sent Petitioner an email regarding oral argument. Petitioner emailed Channing Hoo, back stating that she would like to participate in oral argument.

Channins Hoo, along with clerk christa Mosley, came up with a scheme to deny petitioner from participating in oral argument.

Channins Hoo, stated petitioner need to call christa mosley to get the call in number and do a dry run.

Petitioner, called Mosley on several occasions and emailed her.

On or about 5/19/2023, Channing Hoo, emailed Petitioner and stated the court submitted the case.

Channing Hoo, posited the emails on the docket. Channing Hoo, omitted two emails between Petitioner, Mosley and himself.

On or about 5/30/2023, the First Appellate District Division Four issued an memorandum opinion.

Justice's Streeter, Fineman, Goldman stated that we resolve this case by memorandum opinion Pursuant to the California standards of Judicial Administration section 8.1 in violation 18 U.S.C 1962 (d) 18 U.S.C 1962 (c). 18 U.S 73 obstruction of Justice

The Justices stated on there memorandum opinion that they considered the content of the June 17, 2022, hearing as part of our review of the July

1, 2022. We deem the appeal to be from the July 1, order

On page two of the memorandum opinion at the bottom of the page, the justices state that Washington also alleged self-dealing by the realtor selling the home which the record does not support. Washington made additional allegations not relevant to this appeal. We do not address them.

On page three, under discussion, the justices state Washington primarily contends that her brother and Alden committed fraud and embezzlement in conjunction with the sale of the real property. Washington has not supported her contention with citation to the record. 18 U.S. Code Chapter 73

The justices went on to say, Washington has not

identified anything in the record that indicates that fraud was committed in connection with the beneficiary addresses or that any alleged fraud impacted the sale of the property.

The Justice also stated Washington, is also concerned that Joseph Washington name is on the sale contract and other documents, he is deceased rather than in Joseph Lee Washington name. She does not indicate how these alleged inconsistencies amount to fraud or embezzlement. Nor how her concerns regarding these clerical errors overcome the presumption of correctness we afford the trial court determinations.

Washington has not demonstrated error in the trial court rulings.

that was filed on 12/19/2022. Channing Hoo stated he didn't get the brief. Petitioner went into her back pak and pulled out the copy Mr. Channing Hoo stamped. Channing Hoo stated he would go look for the brief. 18 U.S.C 1349, 18 U.S.C 1962 (d) U.S code 73 obstruction of Justice

When Channing Hoo came back, he had petitioner brief which was all crumbled up. Mr. Channing Hoo, stated, he would scan it into the computer.

On or about, 2/14/2023, petitioner was required to file a fee waiver.

Petitioner, filed the fee waiver with the clerk. The clerk stated, she would submitte the waiver to Channing Hoo.

Petitioner, a week later received a letter from the clerk of the court, dismissing her appeal, due to petitioner, not filing a fee waiver.

California Procedural code states you must submitte a opinion with detail in an appeal.

California Code 604 under section 604, a presumption affecting the burden of producing evidence requires that presumed fact be assumed only until evidence which support a finding of its non-existence is Produced.

Petitioner, citation of the record, came from Alameda superior court clerk, which was certified by the head clerk.

Petitioner, followed the rule of evidence and all citation came from the record. The facts do not lie.

Mathew Alden, on page 51 of the ET stated he didn't think that anyone from the decedants family could see the fraud that was taken place in Alameda county superior Probate court.

After Petitioner filed her opening brief an
appellant clerk stated they under estimated
Petitioner.

On or about, July 8, 2023, petitioner, Petitioner
the supreme court of California for review case #
328020.

Mathew Alden. On or about, July 10, 2023, had
a hearing on a first and final report. Judge C. Don
clay, was presiding; due to Judge Sandra K. Bean,
had been removed from the case and was no longer
in the building. violation of 18 U.S.C 1962 (d) 18 U.S.C 1951(a)
18 U.S.C 1962(c) U.S. 18 chapter 73 obstruction of Justice

Petitioner. filed an objection to Mathew Alden
First and final report.

Petitioner, also filed a stay, which was granted by the court.

Code of civil procedure section 916 provides that the perfecting of an appeal stay proceedings in the trial court upon the judgment or order appealed from or upon the matter embraced therein or affected thereby, including enforcement of the judgment or order but the trial court may proceed upon any other matters embraced in the action and not affected by the judgment.

However, once a stay is in place the trial court power are restricted.

Therefore, the court didn't have jurisdiction over the hearing.

On or about October 02, 2023, a remitter was filed by the appeals court.

On or about October 10, 2023, the Alameda county clerks offices, filed the remitter under miscellaneous 8/16/22. However, In Matthew Alden first and final report the report was filed in Joseph Washington name.

On line 8 of the report, it stated all inventor and appraisals filed in the case represent all assets that petitioner, knew about and of which came into his possession. Mr. Matthew Alden, didn't list the bank accounts that he testified about on the June 17, 2022 hearing. Nor did he list the insurance policies. Who paid for decedant funeral?

Judge C. Don. Clay allowed Matthew Alden to reserve the amount of \$ 9,545.40 and granted him extornary fees.
in violation of 18 U.S.C 1962(C) (d) 18 U.S.C 1951(a) 18 U.S 73
obstruction of justice 0

On or about 8/11/23, Petitioner filed a notice of appeal
Case # A168483.

Petitioner requested the transcripts and recored from the July
10, 2023. hearing. Head clerk, Chad Finke, along with Calderon
only sent the case register of action and 180 court documents.
18 U.S code chapter 73 obstruction of justice

The transcripts from the July 10, 2023, hearing was not
in the documents. in violation of 1962(C) 18 U.S code chapter 73
obstruction of justice.

On or about, 12/18/2023, Petitioner filed her opening brief.

On or about April 2024, Petitioner participated in oral arguments.

Furthermore, five days before oral arguments, Channing
Hoo. sent Petitioner a notices that oral agument was
charged from 10:00am to 9:45am

The day of the hearing the court assigned Pro tem
Justice Charles Smiley, of Alameda County Superior Court to
hear the case due to one of the justices removed her self.

On or about 4/11/24 the appellant court issued a memorandum opinion. The court didn't send petitioner a copy of the opinion.

According to practices and procedures petitioner only ~~had~~ has within 15 days to petition the court for a rehearing for errors in law and procedural process.

On or about April 2024, petitioner filed for review in the appellant court.

Then petitioner, petition the California Supreme Court
Case # S285035

Never the less, petitioner is not the only one complaining about the scheme that is taken place in Alameda County superior Probate court, and the appellant court.

On or about April 27, 2024, Petitioner talked with Amy E. Shrigo, Chief of Staff for Keith Carson, Alameda County Supervisor at a Albany information fair. The fair was held at the Albany library.

Amy E. Shrigo stated this problem of injustices has been going on for years and they have had other complaints.

About two weeks later Petitioner called Amy Shrigo. Petitioner asked, could she have some of the names and phone numbers of others that were complaining. Amy said No, but there was a man who made a youtube video about the Alameda County Probate Court.

On or about 2019 Allstate Insurance placed a bounty of 1 million dollars on Petitioner head.

This is due to petitioner uncovered that Alameda County Superior Court and federal officials are using the ~~court~~ power of the court to conduct racketeering schemes.

Over the past years ^{Petitioner} I have collected document that verify facts. However, you will find ^{Petitioner} ~~my~~ account of these event to be credible because in most all cases multiple fact patterns are consistent with one another. 26

18 U.S. code 73

Obstruction of Justice is a federal crime that can be a basis for racketeering prosecution under the racketeering influenced and corrupt organization Act. Obstruction of justice is defined as any act that interferes with the legal system or the investigation of a crime.

On or about 10/21/24, the supreme court of the United States received Petitioner's writ of certiorari. The clerk sent the original and ten copies back to petitioner with a letter

The letter stated petitioner was over the page count and needed to include an order from the appellate court. Petitioner has 60 days from 10/21/24 to fix the issue or choose not to file the writ.

The statement of the case was only 40 pages.

On or about 10/20/24 Petitioner filed a review in the court of

The court stated in a letter to petitioner they need 60 more days to make a decision then they dismissed the case

On or about 7/2022, Petitioner filed a review in the California Supreme Court they sent Petitioner a letter that they need 60 more days to make a decision. This also happen on 4/2023 or about then the court dismissed the case

On or about 4/2020 Petitioner filed a complaint with the IRS over sight b they writ petitioner back and stated the need 60 more days and dismissed the case and kept petitioner tax money.

Petitioner, feels that the courts need 60 more days for the enterprise and others to retrieve the court documents from her.

18 USC 1962 (c)(d) 18 US 73

18 U.S.C 1343 Wire Fraud

Section 1343 directly parallel those of the mail fraud statute but require the use of an interstate telephone or electronic communication made in furtherance of the scheme. *United States v. Briscoe*, 65 F 3d 576, 583 7th Cir 1995. The four essential elements of wire fraud are 1. that the defendant voluntarily and intentionally devised or participated in a scheme to defraud another out of money. 2. that the defendant did so with the intent to defraud. 3. That it was reasonable foreseeable that interstate wire communications would be used and that interstate wire communications were in fact used.

In *United States v. Faulkner* 17 F 3d 745, 771 (5th Cir 1994)

1. a scheme to defraud and the participation in the scheme and to furtherance of scheme.

Mathew Alden, along with other Alameda County officials participated in the scheme and now it went deeper than just there participation. in violation of 18 U.S.C 1962(d), 1962(c)

18 U.S.C 1962 (c)

Section 1962(c) requires the existence of two distinct entities: a person and an 'enterprise' that is not simply the same person referred to by a different name. Criminal liability depends showing that the person conducting or participated in the conduct of the enterprise affairs.

For purposes of Rico, a corporate employee a (natural person) is distinct from the corporation itself, a legally different entity with different rights and responsibilities due to its different legal status, even where the employee is the corporation's sole owner.

Likewise, the existence of an enterprise is separate from the pattern of racketeering activity in which the enterprise engages.

The enterprise is proved by evidence of an ongoing organization and by evidence that various associates function as a continuing unit.

While the pattern of racketeering activity is proved by evidence of at least two racketeering acts committed by participants in the enterprise.

The law also allows prosecutors to charge organization leaders for that they ordered others to commit.

United States v. Turkette, 452 U.S. 576, 583 (1981) "The enterprise is an entity, for present purposes a group of persons associated together for a common purpose of engaging in a course of conduct. The pattern of racketeering is, on the other hand, a series of criminal acts as defined by the statute."

Allstate insurance. Judge Jo-Lynn Q Lee, Attorney D. Pike esq. and others are placing Mark E. Spencer, Elve Whitehead and others on juries to manipulate the outcome for the insurances companys. Case # H616799652

On or about July ~~20~~²¹, 2019, there was a jury trial in case H616799652.

32

During voir dire, there was a white man that was communicating with Gregory D. Pike esq. from the jury box. Petitioner removed him.

Then there was an Asian lady about 35 to 40 years old the lady had Black long hair, black eyes about 5'4. The lady would not make eye contact and she looked suspicious.

Petitioner used her challenge to remove the lady from the jury. At that time Judge Lee, became upset and asked petitioner why did petitioner want her removed. Petitioner told Judge Lee, that she just wanted her removed.

At that point, Judge Lee, told the clerk in a very loud voice poll up the list. Then Judge Lee dismissed both sides until the next day.

Petitioner, sat out side of department 18 and watched Gregory D. Pike and his client go back into the court to have an ex parte meeting with Judge Lee.

32 note Mark E. Spencer was juror # 7 and Elise Whithead was juror 5.

The next day we resumed with voir dire. That when Gregory O. Pike esq. picked Mark E. Spencer and Elve Whitehead.

After picking the jury we took lunch. It became very apparent to petitioner what was going on. The jurors were having meeting with Judge Lee. There was a black clerk she had one of her relative come to be a juror, they had the same last name, and they looked just alike.

Two days later the jury got the case. Petitioner was seated out side by the elevator, Mark E. Spencer came out of the doors by department 17 and gave a note to the Judge in department 19 before she got on the elevator. The Judge next door in department 19 was some white lady with sand ~~at~~ blonde hair about 5'5 she had her robe on.

A lady was seated next to petitioner and she ^{stated} ~~said~~ to petitioner did you see that, petitioner, said yes.

Petitioner wrote a letter to the ^{presid} Judge and took it over to her department 1 and gave it to her clerk.

Allstate insurance. Judge Jo-Lynn Q. Lee, Attorney Gregory D. Pike esq. Mark E. Spencer, Attorney, Elve Whitehead became part of an enterprise because they need to get court documents Petitioner has that proves there ^{participation} in this scheme. in violation of 18 1962 (C)(d)

Federal Judge Joseph C. Spero and Jeffrey S. White covered up the scheme. Case # 4:19-cv-02271-JSW

Judge Sandra K. Bean, Judge C. Don Clay, Matthew Alden Lonnie S. Dilard, Channing Hoo, Justices Streeter, Goldman, Fineman and other joined the enterprise to recover there court documents.

On or about 2/2022 Petitioner filed an objection to remove the administrator. In that objection Petitioner stated that she was being hunted by someone that Judge Jo-Lynn Q. Lee sent to get court documents back.

Further, Matthew Alden and Channing Hoo are attorneys they participated in the conduct of the enterprise affairs, by collection of an unlawful debt.

The enterprise is the Judges and Justices, due to there conduct and there participation in the enterprise affairs. They are the organization leaders and they order others to commit racketeering acts. They are acting as individuals not as Justices

United States v Turkette 452, US 576, 583 (1981) The enterprise is an entity, for present purposes a group of Persons associated together for a common purpose of engaging in a course of conduct.

The Court dose not operate like this in there day to day operation. The Judges and Justices are to interpret the law, not chose who get equal protection of the law.

The enterprises is coordinating with a secret organization that is made up of the CIA, FBI, Homeland security, military personal, Chinese government, Russian kill team and others

The military wet work team. has the resoures of the US government and companys. They operate without the

36

Knowledge of those who are outside their organization.

The enterprise and this organization act as one.

The enterprise hires the organization to murder the petitioner and destroy the court documents.

On or about 12/25/20, a team of IRS agents tried to retrieve the court documents from petitioner at the courtyard Marriott in Foster City, CA.

On that same date Homeland Security was at the Marriott in Foster City, CA. When petitioner looked out her window there was a white man sitting in a SUV that said, Homeland Security, at that time all petitioner's ^{electronic} devices went dead.

On or about 12/7/2020, Petitioner checked into the Days in by Wyndham, in Sunnyvale, CA. The FBI had sent a team. One of the men on the FBI's team drives a Black two door Mustang, license plate number 8FB2982

On that same date one of the FBI team tried to open

Petitioner

37

~~the~~ hotel room door. The man drove a Rav 4 license
license plate 8NMB 229. The Two men were both monitoring
the petitioner while in her room.

On or about 10/19/2020, Petitioner filed a report with
the San Mateo County sheriff department on line at 3:03pm
regarding this same behavior when checking into the Lia Hotel.

The FBI, had a team which monitored petitioner in her
room and tried to open the door. There was a Puerto Rican
man and women, Milk, and Brandon and his mother. Brandon
was about 20 to 25 years 5'11" 190 lb Brown eyes. Brandon mother
was about 55 years old 5'3" older looking. They were black.

On or about 1/22/21, Petitioner was a participant in
the Fremont winter shelter. The military and ill had
a team present. The military had a man in the parking lot
in a camper and had three agents sleeping in the shelter.

The man in the blue camper was white about 50-55 years
he was using a high powered microwave system that

disperse RF radio frequency energy.

38

Illuminati would come a 1:00 am to try to pull petition out of the shelter. One of the staff would open the door. Sometimes Illuminati would be in the parking lot at the shelter at 1:00 am.

Everyone at the shelter would tell Petitioner when the FBI, military and Illuminati were going to come.

On or about 2/24/21, Petitioner had a meeting with Laura Flories, program director, about the problems.

Laura Flories, stated she was trying to keep everyone calm.

Laura Flories and the FBI came up with a scheme to get the Petitioner out of the ~~secret~~ shelter.

On or about 11/21/20, The FBI, military and the ^{Chinese} ~~Asian~~ government were present at the Best Western Plus Silicon in Sunnyvale, ca 94085.

On or about, the summer of 2020, Petitioner stayed at

39

the Holiday Inn Express in sunnyvale. That when the FBI stated sending Middle Eastern to do surveillance and to us the RF energy on petitioner in her room.

Therefore, Petitioner didn't know the Russians were involved, until 60 minutes did a story on the "Havana syndrome who is ~~attacking~~ ^{attacking} FBI, CIA agents over sea". The report ran on April 20, 2024.

The Russian wet work team is experts at killing. The Russians have a offices on 1301 Koahitoutek #23. During the summer of 2023 and 2024 they would rent Penske trucks and other items to gang stalkers, ~~how~~ who were trying to get the court documents.

On or about June 4, 2024, the russian man that was named in the 60 min. report, Albert Avaryono, appeared ~~across~~ ^{across} the street in the target parking lot, on whipple and wiegman in Hayward ca. The petition parks her car there from 4pm til 10:30am daily.

On or about, July ²⁰²⁴ the second Thursday of the month at 6:58pm a russian man driving an 2010 min van, light gold pulled across the street from petition car an released muster gas.

The man was about 55 to 60 years of age thin, salt and pepper hair.

The next morning, a big russian man appeared in the same spot.

On or about, 9/2020, Petitioner was told to go and talk to an officer at the Santa Clara Police Station. Due to when staying at a hotel on Stevens creek, in Santa Clara Ca. The SCPD was doing surveillance on petitioner along with the military and FBI.

Petitioner had a conversation with a lieutenant that stated that he would talk with the officers, that was doing the surveillance. The lieutenant went on to say that the insurance company has deep pockets.

18 U.S.C 1952 Murder for Hire scheme

Whoever, as consideration for receipt of, or as consideration for a promise or agreement to pay, anything of pecuniary value from an enterprise engaged in racketeering activity, or for purpose of gaining entrance to or maintaining or increasing position in an enterprise engaged in racketeering activity

Tyreek has a team to help him complete the murder. The team consist of Kathy Washington, Christina Washington, Union City PD, Hayward PD, Hayward CHP, Newark PD, Dublin PD, Albany PD, Redwood cy PD, San Mateo and Alameda County sheriff department and others.

Unfortunately, Tyreek, has diarrhea of the mouth.

Tyreek told petitioner that he meet with Kathy Washington and Nonna Washington and they liked him. So Petitioner had to like him. Tyreek also stated he was from Texas.

Kathy Washington, Nonna Washington and Christina Washington were assi. Tyreek, in the murder of Petitioner, by when petitioner come over to there home located at 4508 Laura Way, Union cy they would have petition stand out side in the back yard or front yard, so when the military helicopter with the gun on it could shoot petitioner. or they would try to send her to meet ~~petit~~ Christina Washington somewhere the military was.

Kana Jackson, Petitioner, sister told petitioner, that the above was

were
~~was~~ assisting Tyreek in petitioner murder.

Kara Jackson, also went on to say. she was tired of the police calling her.

Tyreek, in the summer of 2023 told petitioner he was going to pull her out of her car and then have sex with her.

Tyreek, started lasering Petitioner's hair off her head in March of 2023 and sending the pic. to Kathy Washington. Kathy Washington would send (text) Pic. to the team. 18 U.S.C 1343

In the summer of 2023, Naomi ~~Hortle~~ Washington and Brooklen Holiday came from Las Vegas and stated Kathy Washington, had sent Pic. of where ~~the~~ petitioner hair was missing.

Kathy Washington, also took Naomi and Brookly to get paid around the corner from 4508 Laura way Union City CA 94587.

On or about, 4/2023, Petitioner. file a on line Police report with Hayward PD at the E-Retto library.

At that time petitioner was being monitored by a group ⁴⁴ of young people from the age of 21-24. There was a young black lady, latino man and a white boy.

After petitioner filed the report the latino man went outside and made a phone call.

Also, at night there was a Federal agent, that was deep under cover. The agent was not doing surveillance on petitioner and monitoring what was going on. The agent would come every four months or so.

When the agent found out that Tyreek was burning Petitioner, they had a heated argument.

Tyreek, RF laser weapon was attached to his trailer, and is very sensitive to vibrations so the agent would send motorcycles to knock it off line. Tyreek, would get so mad because he couldn't burn Petitioner.

The last time petitioner talked with the agent he ⁴⁵
told her he was not coming back.

Then four weeks went by and he was back.

At that time, the beef that the agent and Tyreek ~~had~~
had with each other became palpable.

The agent knocked Tyreek truck off line, he couldn't
fix it. Tyreek just sat there shaking his head.

Then about one to two weeks later, Tyreek told petitioner
petitioner that he killed the agent with a gun.

Tyreek, stated ~~I was~~ petitioner was next. Tyreek keep on
sending Pic. of guns to Petitioner Phone.

On or about, 10/14/24 Tyreek, Told Petitioner that the
FBI was trying to pin the agent murder on him.

Tyreek, went on to say, please don't file the petitions
because he just had a new baby, and if Petitioner told

he would kill petitioner and her little boyfriend.

Tyreek, had some black women 300lb, with Brown eyes make a youtube video. The lady said on the video Lisa, your lying. Then Tyreek disable the phone.

On or about, 10/17/24 Tyreek, said someone told him petitioner was helping the FBI with there investigation. Petitioner never has talked to the FBI about what Tyreek told petitioner about the murder.

Petitioner dose not no why this come as a surprise to the FBI, because Tyreek had pulled a gun out on some man, who came to see him at his truck in the summer of 2023.

Therefore, the FBI along with others sent Tyreek to kill Petitioner so whats a goon to a goblin?

When Tyreek return from being investigated he act like he got away with something.

RICO conspiracy Provision focuses on the act of agreement. Therefore, a person who conspires to commit a substantive offense under section 1962(a)(6) or (c) can be convicted of a RICO conspiracy, even without personally committing or agreeing to commit a racketeering activity or collection of a unlawful debt.

Nor does a RICO conspiracy require proof that an enterprise actually existed or that a pattern of racketeering activity actually occurred.

^ Rather, it requires only that the conspirator intend to further an endeavor which, if completed, would satisfy all the elements.

Therefore, these are some of the person who conspired to commit a substantive offense under 1962 (d)

Hayward officer Suzuki, Badge # 418 on come to take a report about Tyreek burning petitioner ^{Report} Report #

Petitioner, gave officer Suzuki, the same information under ⁴⁸
18 U.S.C 1958 Murder for hire.

Officer Suzuki, took pic. while taking the report officer Suzuki kept running back and forth to his car. Suzuki was talking to someone on the Phone.

At one point, officer Suzuki, put the phone down and asked petitioner, how did petitioner know Treck name.

On or about, 8/26/24, petitioner went to get a copy of the report. Petitioner was told there was no report filed just a incident happen.

On or about, 9/12/24, Treck, burned and lazered petitioner hair off. Petitioner called Hayward PD out to the scene, officer J. De Alba and Training officer B. Tong come out to take the report.

Further officer B. Tong and J. De Alba was trying to set petitioner up by impersonating officer Suzuki.

While the officer were taking the report, two of the Hayward CHP officer that used there RF weapon on petitioner started came

49

into the parking lot. One of the officers drives the black and white SUV and the other officer is in the all white crewser. Petitioner does not know the officers names, but petitioner can pick them out of a line up.

On or about, 10/24/24, at 1:15 am, Hayward officer Wade along with his partner and others come and tried to break into petitioner car.

The two officers tried to open the passenger door with some tool, that left marks on the door, and take the top off the back window.

Petitioner, sat and listened while the two officers tried to open the door. The officers stated I can't get it open.

Petitioner, yelled, who are you bitch. The officer stated Hayward Police.

Petitioner, asked the officer why are you trying to break into my car. The officer replied, he thought he heard yelling coming from the car.

at 1:27 am petitioner called dispatch and asked for the officers name.

On or about 10/24/24, ^{at 10:30 am} petitioner called and talked with a dispatch named Mekla. Petitioner told Mekla what happen and Petitioner need to get officer Wade Partner name.

Mekla wouldn't give petitioner the second officer name, she stated that anyone could come to your car and say there a Police officer. Petitioner told Mekla that she called dispatch at 1:27 am.

Petitioner called internal affairs on that same date and left a message.

On or about 10/29/24, at 12:41 pm, Lieutenant Vonn esut call Petitioner. Lieutenant Vonn esut was very condescending. The lieutenant said he would talk ~~two~~ ^{to} the officers, but would not tell petitioner the other officers name.

On or about 5/2023 Petitioner received Fraud Parking Citation from officer 1457. There were about five. The parking Citation were issued at 4:31 am.

Target located at 2499 Whipple, Hayward, Ca also
 conspired with the enterprise by agreeing to allow big rigs
 to park in there loading docks and release radiation and
 other ce at petitioner car while parked on wigwagman
 and whipple.

The big rigs would come from 6pm til 9am. This started
 10/2022 until May 2024. Now Fed x comes and release
 radiation and other chemicals that started in Sept. 2024
 until 12/7/24

The numbers on the side of the trucks mean something

there link to accounts. 29155, 75PH237, Ventura TV US dot

4188003, 178264, US dot 2814409, CA 475637 / com 938379, vin
 FN193743 lic # 3922663, 11/11/24 55av896 9LPM984, 69753
 Iron mountain info management US dot 3338113, lic 9405146
 Mex FA 30016 cuw1848 Costco CA 64254 Cwu 80005

Also, Albany Ca Thrives together city of Albany and Albany
 Police department conspired with the enterprise under 181922(c)
 181922(c)

Albany Co Thrives together is where Petitioner take showers at due to they have a shower program every Friday at the Albany Aquatic Center 1311 Portland, Margie Marks and other are in charge.

Annemarie Heineman, Rec and Svcs. Supervisor for the city of Albany has a contract with insight housing they find housing for the unhoused. Carol is insight Rep.

Margie Marks is having other unhoused participants in the program follow and threaten petitioner. Margie also sends men, to watch petitioner take a shower and point there RF weapon at her while in the bathroom.

In exchange for doing these things, Margie calls Annemarie Heineman and get tell her to get them housing.

On or about, 8/2024 a Participant in the program after going outside with Margie came back inside and got in petitioner face and started yelling "they want you dead I'm going to

53

Kill you. Gretchen also, told petitioner that she was going to have petition killed.

~~Eliza~~ Elizabeth, is a nother participant that work with Margie. Elizabeth was putting bleach on participant clothes and following petitioner around when in Berkeley.

In 2022 Petitioner went and asked Annemarie about housing. Annemarie said she had a spot in Richmond Ca. in the bad area.

On or about 12/6/24, Annemarie stated to petitioner that she wish petitioner would go over to the property in Richmond. Petitioner asked other did Annemarie offer them the property in Richmond they stated no. Petitioner belives this is a set up.

On or about, 11/8/24, Petitioner went to the Albany PD to file a Polices report, due to someone put a governor on her car while at the shower program.

Petitioner talked with dispatch which was a women. Petitioner explained to her what was going on. The dispa stated she would send

Someone out to make a report. The Petitioner told the dispatcher that she was going to the shower program can the officer come there. The dispa told petitioner to come back after showering.

When Petitioner got to the shower program there were under cover PD and some gang stocker riding up and down the street. When getting out of the shower someone put a RF device in Petitioner car.

On or about 11/8/24, Petitioner went to the Albany Library and called Albany PD. The same dispatch answer. The disp stated to petitioner why you did not come back to the Polices station on 11/7/24, you said you would. Petitioner made the call at 12:00pm

Petitioner went to her car and waited until 1:30pm. No one came. While waiting Petitioner saw the same gang stocker riding up and down the street whe at the shower program on 11/7/24.

That night on 11/8/24, the Albany Police along with others came to retrieve Petitioner back park.

The Elcerrto Library staff Anasa, esteban, Hyde, Jessy have a team. The group allows the ^{chines} government Illuminati and other to come to the library and monitored petitioner while

on the computer. The Chinese government brings there RF weapon into the library while kids are there and release other chem into the air. Petitioner wrote a letter to the city manager 2021/2022. (The stuff is getting paid to do so.)

Hyde, the manager at the library was trying to get this homeless man to fight petitioner. Someone shot the man in the head, in front of the library.

Were do they store the bodys at? On or about 2022

Petitioner had a storage at Storewell storage located at 28410 Hesperian Blv. Hayward CA 94608 1962 (C) 18 U.S.C (1958)

Devan was the manager and Chad is the owner of Storewell Storage.

On or about, April of 2022, Chad had the enterprise team come and install in the bathroom, an RF weapon. This was do to Petitioner would come and use the bathroom, all most every day.

On or about, the summer June or July of 2022, there was a strong smell of a body coming out of a unit on the first floor. Two days later there was a big bleach spot on the floor in front of that unit. Devan told Petitioner to come get her stuff out of her unit Petitioner had a bill. Devan, ^{stated} said she didn't have to pay it.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

The reason the petition should be granted it is necessary to ensure proper safeguards are in place to protect the intended victims of fraud and undue influence.

The petition should also be granted to avoid the creation of a two-tiered judicial system.

The decision of the California Supreme Court is in conflict with another appellate courts and the constitution of the United States. and

The Declaration of Independence Article III section 1 states that judges both of the supreme and inferior courts, shall hold their offices during good behaviour.

There is no mysterious origins who is targeting Americans and U.S government employees its the CIA, FBI, and others together.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Washington

Date: 12/10/24