

Supreme Ct. U.S.


Writ of Mandamus

Unique Circumstances

No. **24-7159**

ORIGINAL

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES



DONTRAY L. BROWN, - PETITIONER

Vs.

BRENDA K. STOSS, et al.; - RESPONDENTS

ON PETITION FOR PECULIAR EMERGENCY
AND PUBLIC IMPORTANCE FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS
DIRECTED TO THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT KANSAS

PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

Name: Dontray L. Brown

Date: February 21st, 2025

Signed: *Dontray L. Brown*

Esq; Pro Se

Address: 1130 Cloud Circle

Salina, Ks 67401

Contact: (785) 337 - 5006

Email: Yahelsion@gmail.com

Prepared by: D. L. Brown

Sup. Ct. U.S. Wash, DC

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1. Does the U.S. Const. Amd. "4th, 5th, 6th, & 14th" Preclude deprivation of Life, Liberty, or Property without Due Process of the Law?
2. Does the U.S. Const. Amd. 5, 6, & 14 preclude the dismissal of action's w/out proper Procedural-Due Process of the Law?
3. Does the U.S. Const. 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, & 14th, Amd. preclude the premises outlined in 18 U.S.C. 241 & 18 U.S.C. 242?

i

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	i - ii
TABLE OF CITATIONS & APPENDICES.....	iii - iv
INTRODUCTION.....	I
BASIS FOR INVOKING THE JURISDICTION OF THE COURT..	I
STATEMENT OF THE FACTS.....	II - p. 7
NATURE OF THE RELIEF SOUGHT.....	p. 7
ARGUMENT.....	p. 7 - 10
I. PETITIONER HAS A CLEAR LEGAL RIGHT AS A CITIZEN OF THE UNITED STATES PER THE U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL AMD. INCLUDING THE BILL OF RIGHTS.....	p. 7 - 8
II. THE JUDGE OF THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS HAS A CLEAR LEGAL DUTY TO INTERPRET UPHOLD AND ENFORCE THE LAWS OF THE LAND WITHOUT PREJUDICE AND IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE CORRECT RULES OF LAW...	p. 8 - 9
III. PETITIONER HAS NO OTHER ADEQUATE REMEDY AS THE PETITIONER HAS EXHAUSTED EVERY EFFORT	

ii

POSSIBLE FROM THE SUPREME/APPELLATE COURT OF KANSAS, THE DISTRICT COURT OF KANSAS, AND THE 10TH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS.....	9 - 10
CONCLUSION.....	10 - 11
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE.....	12

iii

TABLE OF CITATIONS

Cases

Joseph v. Rowlen 402 F.2d 367 (7th Cir. 1968)
Manuel v. City of Joliet, 85 U.S.L.W. 4130 (2017)
Wolff v. McDonnell 418 U.S. 539 (1974)
Goldberg v. Kelly 397 U.S. 254 (1970)
Morrissey v. Brewer 408 U.S. 471 (1972)
Cleveland Board of Education v. Loudermill 470 U.S. 532 (1985)

**STATUTES, CONSTITUTIONAL
PROVISIONS, AND RULES OF COURT**

K.S.A. 12-105b - "Procedure for payment of claims, Presentment of Claims, Claims that could give rise under the Kansas Tort Claim Act"
K.S.A. 61-2904 (a)(b)(1)(2) - "Appearance; Answer; Counterclaim; Affirmative Defenses"
K.S.A. 75-6101 - 6115 - "Kansas Tort Claim Act"
K.S.A. 22-2707 - "Issue Of Governor's Warrant Of Arrest; Recitals"
K.S. A. 22 - 2703 - "Form Of Demand"
K.S.A. 22 - 4401 Art. III (a)(d) - "Agreement on Detainers; Contents"
K.S.A. 22 - 4401 Art. IV (a)(b) - "Agreement on Detainers; Contents"
K.S.A. 22 - 4401 Art. V (b)(2) - "Agreement on Detainers; Contents"
Fed. R. Civ. P. 8 (a)(1)(2)(3) - "General Rules of Pleading"
18 U.S.C. 241 - "Conspiracy Against Rights"
18 U.S.C. 242 - "Deprivation Of Rights Under Color Of Law"
42 U.S.C. 1983 - "Civil Action For Deprivations Of Rights"
U.S. Const. Article VI Para II - "Supremacy Clause"
U.S. Const. 4th Amd. - "Unreasonable Seizures By Government"

iv

U.S. Const. 5th Amd. - "Double Jeopardy"

U.S. Const. 5th Amd. - "Due Process - Citizens Cannot Be Deprived"

U.S. Const. 6th Amd. - "Right To Fair Trial"

U.S. Const. 7th Amd. - "Right To Jury Trial - Certain Dollar Value"

U.S. Const. 8th Amd. - "Cruel & Unusual Punishment"

U.S. Const. 14th Amd. - "Procedural Due Process"

U.S. Const. 14th Amd. - "Equal Protection Of The Laws"

U.S. Const. 14th Amd. - "Rights Guaranteed"

U.S. Const. Article III S1. 5.2 - "Reopening Final Judicial Decisions"

Kan. R. Rel. Jud. Cond. Rule 601B Canon 2 - "Impartial Performance of Duty" - Rule 2.2 "Impartiality & Fairness" - Rule 2.3 "Bias, Prejudice, & Harassment" (A) & (B) - 2.5 "Competence, Diligence, & Cooperation" (A) & Comment(s) [1] & [4] - Rule 2.6 "Ensuring The Right To Be Heard" (A) & Comment [1]

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Copy of 42 U.S.C. 1983 Civil Action

Appendix B: Copy of order of Dismissal

Appendix C: Copy of Motion To Reconsider Dismissal of Action

Appendix D: Copy of Notice of Appeal U.S. 10th Cir. Ct. Appeals

Appendix E: Copies of Evid. submitted including Fraud docs & invalid issuance of warrant(s) no grounds to Extradite

Appendix F: Copies of orders from previously filed Writ of Mandamus, filed with the Sup. Ct. Ks.; prior denial relief; presented issues stated in the 2nd Amended 42 U.S.C. 1983 action.

Appendix G: Order of Dismissal of PFA

I

INTRODUCTION

The intel & or contents of this action will illustrate to the courts the Petitioners' effortless attempts to resolve all matter(s) prior to any request to invoke the jurisdiction of the *United States Supreme Ct.*; presenting concern(s) & unique issues regarding *Stat. rules, U.S. Const. Amds, Article VI para 2., & 18 U.S.C. 241 - 242* 'Conspiracy' action(s).

BASIS FOR INVOKING THE JURISDICTION OF THE COURT

Question(s) Presented

1. {*Can an United States citizen be deprived of Life, Liberty, or Property without Due Process Of Law - Procedural Due Process Of Law; issues of the U.S. Const. 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, & 14th Amd.*}
2. {*How can a Civil Action that meets the standards or requirements of Federal. R. Civ. P. be dismissed without violation(s) of Due Process of Law - Procedural Due Process of Law being present; issues of the U.S. Const. 5th, 6th, 7th, & 14th Amd.*}
3. {*What action(s), requirements, or standards must be met to constitute a violation(s) of the premises outlined in 18 U.S.C. 241 - 18 U.S.C. 242*}

II**STATEMENT OF THE FACTS**

The petitioner would begin by making the court aware of the fact(s) that all incident(s) are derived from the date(s) of *October 11th, 2021* & *February 17th, 2022*; indicating the duration of time that multiple attacks, infringement(s), harassment, etc. I; the petitioner, have endured.

In short & or brief, beginning with *October 11th, 2021*; an order of *Dismissal of Action(s)* was rendered pertaining to a fraudulently filed PFA. Following the date of the dismissal, the petitioner would still be placed under false arrest several times, resulting with unlawful detention each time I was unconstitutionally detained; with each arrest being in relation to the *Dismissed PFA* dated *October 11th, 2021*. In sum of these mentioned issues; the latest unlawful arrest by the state of Kansas involved the state of Pennsylvania, in who has accepted my *42 U.S.C. 1983* claims (*see 1.24:CV-00271-RAL U.S. Dist. Ct. WDP*A). Closing out the fact(s); violations of *U.S. Const. 14th Amd. & 18 U.S.C. 241-*

242 exists, given the unified effort to deprive '*Life, Liberty, & Property*'.

NATURE OF RELIEF SOUGHT

The petitioner asks & or requests that the *Honorable Supreme Court of the United States* would reopen the matter of "*Dontray L. Brown v. Brenda K. Stoss, et al.*" given the powers vested in the court per *U.S. Const. Article III S1. 5.2*; allowing myself to invoke, assert, & claim my natural rights as an *U.S. citizen* under the *U.S. Const. 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, '14th Amd'*., & the *U.S. Const. Bill of Rights*; entitling me the opportunity to present a proper defense, including any injunctive or further relief that the court deems appropriate or necessary in such an instance; not excluding any action proceeding with original jurisdiction.

ARGUMENT

- I. PETITIONER HAS A CLEAR LEGAL RIGHT AS A CITIZEN OF THE UNITED STATES PER THE U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL AMD.; INCLUDING THE BILL OF RIGHTS -

The Petitioner would cite the *U.S. Const. 14th Amd. Sec. 1* which states:

"All persons born or naturalized in the United States, & subject to the jurisdiction thereof; are citizens of the United States. No state shall make or enforce any 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 law; nor deny any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

May the court note that all alleged infractions are within the contents of the attached appendices; captioned as the 2nd Amended Complaint.

II. THE JUDGE OF THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS HAS A CLEAR LEGAL DUTY TO INTERPRET, UPHOLD, & ENFORCE THE LAWS OF THE LAND WITHOUT PREJUDICE AND IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE GOVERNING RULES OF LAW -

The petitioner references *Kan. R. Rel. Jud. Cond. Rule 601B Canon 2 - "Impartial Performance of Duty;"* specifically *Rule(s) 2.2*

"Impartiality & Fairness," 2.3 "Bias, Prejudice, & Harassment"

(A) & (B), 2.5 "Competence, Diligence, & Cooperation" (A) & comments [1] & [4]; as well as Rule 2.6 "Ensuring The Right To Be Heard" (A) & comment [1]. The petitioner concludes by saying that a dismissal of the 42 U.S.C. 1983 2nd Amended Complaint alleging that I failed to properly state a claim where relief can be granted, is in conflict with the Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule(s) 8 (a)(1)(2)(3); neither was the decision in accordance to K.S.A. 12-105b "Procedure For Payment of Claims, Presentment of Claims, Claims That Could Give Rise Under The Kansas Tort Claim Act," K.S.A. 61-2904 (a)(b)(1)(2) "Appearance, Answer, Counterclaims; Affirmative Defenses;" or K.S.A. 75-6101 - 6115 "Kansas Tort Claim Act."

The dismissal of the action appears to be no more than a delay - deprivation of process to potentially further any efforts to silence me.

III. PETITIONER HAS NO OTHER ADEQUATE REMEDY
AS THE PETITIONER HAS EXHAUSTED EVERY
EFFORT POSSIBLE FROM THE U.S.
SUPREME/APPELLATE COURT OF KANSAS, U.S.
DISTRICT COURT OF KANSAS, AND THE U.S. 10TH
CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS -

The Petitioner states that since the date(s) of *October 1st, 2021 & February 17th, 2022*; several efforts seeking resolution of all matter(s) in this instance were made. The petitioner concludes proclaiming that, the *Municipal Ct. of Salina, Ks., District Ct. Saline Co. Ks., Appellate/Supreme Ct. Ks., U.S. Dist. Ct. Ks., & the U.S. 10th Circuit Ct. of Appeals*; have all shown bias, unjust, & prejudice in their decision(s).

CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE; I, Dontray L. Brown; ask, move, & pray the court to grant this request for "*Peculiar Emergency & Public Importance On Petition For Issuance of Writ of Mandamus*" to the *Supreme Court*

Prepared by: D. L. Brown

Sup. Ct. U.S. Wash, DC

of the United States concerning "Public Safety;" directing the U.S. Dist. Ct. Kansas to reopen & follow the governing rule(s) of law for the said procedures, whilst securing my right(s) under the U.S. Const. Amd. 1-14 & Bill of Rights 1-10; with keen interest towards the scales of Equality, Justice, & Liberty for all; ceasing any further harassment, intimidation, or abuse of authority by public officials; issuing an order that would afford the petitioner his right(s) to the fullest extent; 'exclusively & expressively' the U.S. Const. 14th Amd., with directions to comply with K.S.A. 12-105b & K.S.A. 75-6101 - 6115; noting the violation(s) of K.S.A. 61-2904 (a)(b)(1)(2), K.S.A. 22-2707, K.S.A. 22-2703, K.S.A. 22-4401 Art. III (a)(d), K.S.A. 22-4401 Art. IV (a)(b), K.S.A. 22-4401 Art. V (b)(2), & Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(1)(2)(3); if the Honorable Supreme Ct. of the United States Justices aren't reluctant to render an order for Original Jurisdiction due to the several infractions.