

FILED  
JAN 24 2025

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

No. 24-6535

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Christopher Vitti

PETITIONER

vs.

KEVIN BRIAN JONES et al

RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO  
the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Christopher Vitti

2411 railroad ave

crescent city, CA, 95531

661-506-0871

smithriversurfing@icloud.com

Pro Se Plaintiff

1

questions

2 1 Did the ninth district court error in finding that there's no equitable remedy to make an extension  
3 of statute ; and if the ninth district didn't error, can the Supreme Court under 28 U.S. Code § 2072  
make a remedy for this tort claim by making an extension to the statute?

4 2 Is delay a form of a loss of liberty, justice and due process when having to climb the courts just to  
5 remedy a grievance; or does an action require a day in court for trial or a hearing to be considered  
consistent with due process?

6 3 Should have the lowest federal court offered counsel when in forma pauperis due to the analog  
nature of 18 U.S. Code § 241 and 42 U.S. Code § 1983?

7 4 Did the lower court error in holding that it couldn't look into state proceedings for lack of subject  
matter jurisdiction; or did the lower court improperly decide on the full faith and credit clause  
which led to lack of subject matter jurisdiction?

8 5 Did the lower court error in finding that the right to papers isn't clearly established law?

9 6 Did the lower court error on the state's 11th amendment immunity?

10 7 Did the lower court error in holding that the plaintiff is not entitled to injunctive relief?

11 8 Did the lower court improperly apply Imbler v Pachtman in a way to completely do away with  
Brady vs Maryland and its progeny cases?

12 9 Is there also a first amendment or common law right or both, to court records and writings when  
the vehicle used is the Freedom of Information Act or the State equivalent (CPRA)?

13 10 In regard to all the failures to state a claim and failure to state enough facts, may I in the interest  
of Justice, amend all relevant pleadings like in Rule 15. (A)(2) so granted at the mercy of this court;  
and if this court sees fit to remand this case back to the lower courts for a new trial with time to  
amend the complaint in its entirety?

15

NAME OF PLAINTIFF  
16 Christopher Vitti

17

NAME OF DEFENDANTS  
18 KEVIN BRIAN JONES, COURTNEY WILLIAMS, VERONICA HISOIRE, ADAM SEPT,  
ESPERANZA ESPARZA, DIANA STANLEY, TODD ZOCCHI, KATHERINE MICKS, EDWIN  
MIRAMONTES, DEL NORTE SUPERIOR COURT, and DEL NORTE COUNTY

19

20

21

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....	3
JURISDICTION.....	4
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED .....	4
STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....	4,5,6
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT .....	6,7
CONCLUSION.....	7

## INDEX TO APPENDICES

## APPENDIX A 9th District ruling content

## APPENDIX B Northern California Lower Court Federal District

## APPENDIX C contempt charge

## APPENDIX D contempt trial

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

	CASES	PAGE NUMBER
9	Boyd V US	6
10		

## OPINIONS BELOW

For cases from federal courts: The opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit appears at Appendix A in the petition and is unpublished.

## CHRISTOPHER VITTI.

No. 24-5112 D.C. No. 1:24-cv-00544-RMI  
Northern District of California, San Francisco

V.

KEVIN BRIAN JONES; et al.,

16 The opinion of United States District Court for the Northern District of California Appears at Appendix B in the petition and is unpublished.

17 CHRISTOPHER VITTI,

Case No. 24-cv-00544-RMI  
Northern District of California, San Francisco

Y.

KEVIN BRIAN JONES: et al.

19 For cases from state courts:

The opinion of the Superior Court of California COUNTY OF DEL NORTE Appears at Appendix C in the petition and is unpublished.

21 The People of the State of California

CASE No. : D JC-INTR-2022-2684-1  
Citation number LK52881

1 Vs.  
2 CHRISTOPHER LEE VITTI

3  
4 The opinion of the Superior Court of California COUNTY OF DEL NORTE Appears at Appendix  
5 D in the petition and is unpublished.

6 The People of the State of California

CASE No .: D JC-INTR-2022-2684-1  
7 Citation number LK52881

8 Vs.  
9 CHRISTOPHER LEE VITTI

#### 10 JURISDICTION

11 The date on which the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit decided my case was  
12 10/29/24

13 The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1254(1).

#### 14 CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

15 United States Constitution, Amendment 1th-----	5,7
16 United States Constitution, Amendment 4th-----	5,6,7
17 United States Constitution, Amendment 5th-----	4-8
18 United States Constitution, Amendment 6th-----	4,
19 United States Constitution, Amendment 7th-----	4,
20 United States Constitution, Amendment 8th-----	5
21 United States Constitution, Amendment 9th-----	4,
22 United States Constitution, Amendment 10th-----	4,
23 United States Constitution, Amendment 14th-----	4,

24 local rule of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California

25 7-1. Motions (b)

#### 26 STATEMENT OF THE CASE

27 I'd like to start with I've never had a day in court and most if not all of this could have been avoided  
28 if I had a simple day in court to be heard.

29 Mr. Vitti requested an in-person jury trial at the California Superior Court in Del Norte County. Id.

30 On January 9, 2023, Commissioner Jones presided by Zoom over Mr. Vitti's traffic hearing. Id. Mr.

31 Vitti appeared in person. Id. Contrary to Mr. Vitti's request for a jury trial, Commissioner Jones

32 acted as the sole adjudicator. Id. This, Mr. Vitti alleges, was the first violation of his constitutional

33 rights, specifically, the right to a trial by jury under the Sixth and Seventh Amendments. Id.

1 During his traffic hearing, Mr. Vitti's phone was "unlawfully seized" by Commissioner  
2 Jones. Id. at 9. Although Mr. Vitti was "completely silent" and was not "talking or audio emitting"  
3 from his device, Commissioner Jones ordered court staff to confiscate his phone. Id. at 6. Mr. Vitti  
4 attempted to explain that he needed his phone to mount his defense, but Commissioner Jones  
5 insisted that Mr. Vitti relinquish his phone to the court. Id. Ms. Williams and Ms. Hisoire, both  
6 clerks of the court, "told Mr. Vitti to hand over his phone" (Id. at 10) and bailiff, approached Mr.  
7 Vitti and "asked [him] for his phone but backed off" (id. at 9-10). bailiff also "asked the judge if Mr.  
8 Vitti [would get] his phone back" after the hearing (Id. at 6).

9 Commissioner Jones said he would. Id. Eventually, a CHP Officer "aggressively seized" Mr.  
10 Vitti's phone and, in the process of doing so, "committed battery by taking Mr. Vitti's phone." Id.  
11 at 9-10. Mr. Vitti's phone was returned to him at the conclusion of the proceedings. See id. at 6.  
12 Mr. Vitti alleges that the confiscation of his phone violated his Fourth, Eighth, and Fourteenth  
13 Amendment rights. Id.

14 Without his phone, Mr. Vitti was required to defend his case from memory. Id. at 6.  
15 During the proceeding, Commissioner Jones "rushed" Mr. Vitti, did not give him enough time for  
16 oral argument, and allowed him to speak "only ten words at a time." Id. at 6, 9. Mr. Vitti alleges  
17 that by restricting his oral arguments, Commissioner Jones violated his First and Fourteenth  
18 Amendment rights.

19 Surprised by the chaos in court, Mr. Vitti remarked that the proceedings were "bonkers."  
20 Id. at 6. Commissioner Jones told Mr. Vitti that he was being disrespectful and charged him with  
21 contempt of court. Id. Mr. Vitti was given a sticky note with the date and time for the contempt  
hearing by one of the court clerks. Id. Ultimately, Commissioner Jones found Mr. Vitti guilty of  
the traffic violations and levied fines against him. Id. at 12.

22 After the traffic hearing, Mr. Vitti submitted a records request to the Superior Court for

1 transcripts and video footage of the traffic proceedings. Id. at 7. The request was denied. Id.  
2 Eventually, Mr. Vitti paid \$25 to receive the Superior Court's records of his traffic proceeding. Id.  
3 Mr. Vitti also submitted a request for bailiff's body camera footage from the District  
4 Attorney's Office and, through County Counsel, the Sheriff's Office. Id. These requests were  
5 denied "and then approved but not given anywhere near on time for a fair trial." Id. at 15. Mr. Vitti  
6 alleges that unidentified District Attorneys were uncommunicative and refused to help him obtain  
7 the evidence he needed to prepare for his contempt hearing. Id. at 7. He also alleges that the  
8 Sheriff's Office intentionally deleted the body camera footage, though he later received the  
9 footage he requested. Id. at 8.

10 Mr. Vitti's contempt of court(civil) hearing was held on February 9, 2023. Id. Commissioner  
11 Jones presided over the hearing and the contempt charges (Criminal) were dropped. Id. On March  
12 23, 2023, Mr. Vitti received the body camera footage. Id. at 8. Mr. Vitti alleges that the County and  
13 its employees violated his Fourteenth Amendment rights as well as the California Public Records  
14 Act by completing his records request in an untimely manner. See id. at 13-16.

15 Mr. Vitti filed this Complaint in federal court on January 29, 2024. Id. at 1. On March 4,  
16 2024, CHP Officer Adam Sept filed a Motion to Dismiss pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6) of the Federal  
17 Rules of Civil Procedure. Def.'s Mot. (Dkt. 11). Defendants the bailiff , Diana Stanley,  
18 Katherine Micks, Todd Zocchi, Edwin Miramontes and the County of Del Norte, (collectively, the  
19 "County Defendants") soon followed suit. Def.'s Mot. (Dkt. 14). The final Motion to Dismiss was  
20 filed on March 5, 2024, by Kevin Brian Jones, Esperanza Esparza, Courtney Williams, Veronica  
Histoire, and the Superior Court (collectively, the "Court Defendants") who raised additional  
issues under Rule 12(b)(1) and Rule 12(b)(6). Defs.' Mot. (Dkt. 15). All parties have consented to  
the jurisdiction of a magistrate judge. (Dkts. 10, 13, 15).

21

1 document #7 ORDER FILED A review of the record and the parties' responses to this court's  
2 August 22, 2024 order to show cause demonstrates that this court lacks jurisdiction over this appeal  
3 because the August 20, 2024 notice of appeal was not filed within 30 days after the district court's  
4 judgment entered on July 10, 2024. See 28 U.S.C. § 2107(a); United States v. Sadler, 480 F.3d 932,  
5 937 (9th Cir. 2007) (requirement of timely notice of appeal is jurisdictional); see also Bowles v.  
6 Russell, 551 U.S. 205 (2007) (court lacks authority to create equitable exceptions to jurisdictional  
7 requirement of timely notice of appeal). Consequently, this appeal is dismissed for lack of  
jurisdiction. DISMISSED. [Entered: 10/29/2024 11:28 AM]

8 The following is a list from the history of the case pertaining to appeal  
9 Document 27 Filed & Entered:08/08/2024 Terminated on 8/9/24 notice of appeal to the 9th District  
10 filed and entered on 8/9/24 electronic filing error  
11 filed and entered on 8/16/24 remark  
12 filed and entered on 8/19/24 electronic filing error  
13 filed and entered 8/19/24 remark  
14 Document 28 filed entered 8/19/24 notice of appeal to 9th District terminated 8/19/2024  
15 Document 29 filed entered on 8/20/24 terminated on 10/30/24 notice of appeal to 9th District circuit  
16 the court can see I was actively trying to file.

#### 16 REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

17 The facts truly speak for themselves when it comes to whether there were constitutional violations  
18 and the replies in document 18 shows the 4th amendment, this court , the state law and state  
19 constitution all deem taking papers from a party is a clear violation. It seems they have changed or  
20 improperly applied the original immunity Doctrine and they've changed the qualified immunity  
21 Doctrine to completely freeze time and place the current standard of constitutional law. The courts

1 must do their duty to uphold the law of the land and to end this facade and protect our rights from  
2 both encroachment by individuals and encroachment by the process of the Courts.

3 I ask this court to fully and finally recognize the distinctions between civil and criminal nature  
4 causes. This distinction could also not only Rectify having jury trial in all actions civil and criminal  
5 in California but it could also rectify the lack of criminal protections in a proceeding criminal in  
6 nature but civil in name and action.

7 This court could also move forward with the tradition of the right papers being fully protected  
8 regardless of the form used. This court has already recognized in Riley V California that the right to  
9 papers is Central and that the founders did not fight a revolution to procedure. This being the case  
10 that procedure can block easily something in substance that is a right. California V Riley has  
11 similarly stated that cell phones are mini computers and that only differ from papers on the quality  
12 and quantity of the text they contain, Essentially cell phones are an empty vessel much akin to a  
13 wallet with contexts such as your ID. Other papers have similar protections, so too should your cell  
14 phone data so the court can clearly see that the right moving forward in time runs congruent with a  
15 constitution so that it should not be stuck in a static condition.

16 Well I am not super versed but it is my understanding that currently there is a dispute on whether or  
17 not there's a First Amendment or and a common-law right to courtroom information and courtroom  
18 documents, this Court has never held that this is the case. I ask if this court could clarify that this  
19 truly is a right and that it could truly help with the due process of adjudications by further accessing  
20 information for proper resolution on information before the court so the truth and relatively Justice  
21 may be had. The wise words of the honorable Justice White on a similar matter argued turning over  
more information than necessary, would be beneficial to the judicial process overall.

1  
2 One of the greatest Injustices in this case is not that the wrongs were perpetuated against me but that  
3 they completely deny the right to remedy the breach of rights or to come to a willing understanding  
4 to help others not face the same problems.we could also be training our officers on how to  
5 respect rights, our community and our Judicial process. But instead we reward bad behavior by  
6 protecting them by prolonging the action coming to the light. I haven't had a day in court and I'm  
7 already at the US Supreme Court. I was told that this time I was wronged wouldn't mean that I  
8 would not be given a jury trial when I was brought to court next time. This line of thinking would  
9 defeat the purpose of an injunction. (Doc 24 page 7 line 27 page 8 line 1,2)

9  
10 When it came to the state claims they might not have failed in the same way since qualified  
11 immunity doesn't apply to the bane act. Yet understandably since the federal claims were dismissed  
12 he could and probably had to to some degree dismiss the state claims but I don't see why I couldn't  
13 plead those very same state claims in State Court. Why would I be disbarred from both if I sought a  
14 Federal remedy but could not get it? Why could I not file in state court? In short I feel like judges  
15 think they have carte blanche. Yet for maybe my last cry, heed, we are not great britain.

#### CONCLUSION

15  
16 For the foregoing reasons, The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted review the  
17 judgment in both The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals and the Northern California Federal District.  
18 Respectfully submitted, Christopher Vitti Date: this 19th of January year of 2024

19  
20  
21 /s/ christopher vitti  
christopher vitti