



No. 24- **749**

In the
Supreme Court of the United States

IN RE LORRAINE BOND,
Petitioner.

On Petition for an Extraordinary Writ of Mandamus to the
United States Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit

PETITION FOR AN
EXTRAORDINARY WRIT OF MANDAMUS

Lorraine Bond
Sui Juris
2289 Levy Road
Hardeeville, SC 29927
(843) 288-1045
lwbond0072@gmail.com

January 3, 2025

SUPREME COURT PRESS

♦ (888) 958-5705 ♦

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Should the respondents in the above civil action be allowed to Escape justice when part of the respondents namely the City of Philadelphia, PA have been convicted of the bombing the residents of Osage Ave. along with burning down said property, business along with personal property as well as murdering five babies?

2. Should the petitioner be put out of federal court and told to litigate these issues in state court?

3. Should the respondents be allowed to steal monies or abuse and / or misuse monies that the federal government gave to the City of Philadelphia, PA to compensate plaintiff and the other residents of Osage Ave.?

4. Should this amended complaint under Federals of Civil Procedures Rule 15 (b) be allowed to be heard on the merits of truth, and deprives us of our civil liberty and rights, where the respondents violated the 5th and 14th Amendments of the Constitution of the United States of America and these government officials must pay the plaintiff for the damage of property under this law; and where these government employees all took the swear by oath or / pledged to the Constitution duties of this country must be held to the strict standard of law under section (3) of the 14th Amendment. Was the Petitioner and community were never given a fair treatment of the law by these higher appellate courts, or time bar us out in the cold with our rights to these serious facts and is a serious error by the court, and a Conflict of Law."?

5. Should this court allow petitioner who is *sui juris* to be stripped from her rights because of the 3,

compromise that in this constitution illegally that's denial or 14th and 5th Amendment of the United States Constitutional Law, of the Due Process Clause, which prohibits arbitrary deprivation of "life, liberty, or property" by the government except as authorized by law; and when the U.S. the Supreme Court has interpreted these clauses broadly prior to 2022, concluding that they provide three protection: procedural due process (in civil and criminal proceedings:) substantive due process, a prohibition against vague laws; and as the vehicle for the incorporation of the Bill of Rights?

6. Should the petitioner who is *sui juris* and family, friends, and the community of Osage Ave. suffer by the hands of evil of government officials for 40 years and the torturing by said defendants in the above caption of allowing to escape Equitable Relief, Physiological Damage, Mental Scars, Livelihood, and Sentimental Value etc. and the continuum of egregious malice by the court and the above caption violates the "Equal Protection" clause under the 14th Amendment?

7. Should the question of redressing the nature of the bombing and materials used by United States Government agencies respondents Attorney General Office, FBI, State Officials, and E&I Dupont should be held accountable under the civil rights violation of the rule of law?

8. Should the U.S. Gov. Agencies be allowed to escape murder, whereas pursuant to Title 28 U.S.C. section 1391(e) government officials that reside in the jurisdiction of Washington DC? Should the United States have to perform their duty pursuant to title 28 U.S.C.1361 pertaining to the writ of mandamus?

9. Should the respondents be allowed to get away from the damage, pursuant to Federal Explosive act 844(h) would have given the judge the full power of the law because of the nature of products being convicted?

10. Should the courts in the case let these Federal and State officials be allowed to get out of damage of product liability and violate the Color of Law of due process?

11. Should the Courts / defendants in this above matter be allowed to over violate their federal powers because E&I Dupont inc. are one of the five families that purchased this country and the defendant in this said matter and for these reasons we can't get a fair day in court?

12. Should all branches of this Government of this Republic, that's not a Democracy, be allowed to escape justice for their hypocrisy, contradictions, stolen wealth, abuse of power and to ignore the laws of this land and to violate the people of color that they only saw as little more than a "Beast of Burden"?

13. Should the Framers of the Republic or/Constitution that was that all men considered equal, and was ratified in 1787 have a standing on precedent? Moreover should this Republic continually deny our rights and then conspire together on commission by the US government sending materials to E&I Dupont's Corporation, which led to aiding and abetting under the Civil Rights Conspiracy Statute section 241, along aiding abetting to sabotage our Freedom?

14. Should the defendants and courts be allowed to get away scott-free by not understanding the needs of citizens fighting in the behalf of themselves or / otherwise petitioner who is *sui juris* be treated unfairly

and illegal wrongdoing in the courts, and not have a fair due process of the law? Furthermore, should these federal employees/ judges be able to violate The United States Constitution and make a mockery of settled law?

15. Whether the effects of delay should negate the doctrine of laches in availing the remedies against the final publication of record of rights and maintainability of writ petition when the civil suit filed for same relief was withdrawn without liberty to file fresh one on the concealment of material facts from the court? Whether a party order can rely on notations in the Government files without having communication of any order / or otherwise merits the original judgment of this matter?

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS**Petitioner**

- Lorraine Bond

Respondents

- Office of the Attorney General of the United States
950 Pennsylvania, Ave. NW
Washington DC. 20530-001
- Federal Bureau of Investigations
Headquarters
935 Pennsylvania Ave.
Washington, DC. 20535
- DuPont de Nemours. inc.,
1007 Market St.
Wilmington, DE 19898
- Office of the Philadelphia Fire Commissioner
240 Spring Garden St.
Philadelphia, PA 19123
- Office of Manager and Director of Philadelphia
1401 John F. Kennedy Blvd., Suite 1430
Philadelphia, PA 19102
- Office of Philadelphia Police Department
750 Race St.
Philadelphia, PA 19106
- Office of the Mayor of Philadelphia
City Hall Room 115
Philadelphia, PA 19107
- Pennsylvania State Police
1800 Elmerton Ave.
Harrisburg, PA 17110

LIST OF PROCEEDINGS

U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia

No.1:23-cv-00823

Lorraine Bond, *Plaintiff*, v. Office of the Attorney
General of the United States, et al., *Defendants*

Final Order: February 26, 2024

U.S. Court of Appeals, District of Columbia

No. 22-5274

Lorraine Bond, *Petitioner-Appellant* v. Office of the
Attorney General, et al., *Respondent-Appellee*

Order of Dismissal : February 3, 2023

U.S. Court of Appeals, District of Columbia

No. 22-5272

Lorraine Bond, *Petitioner-Appellant* v. Office of the
Attorney General, et al., *Respondent-Appellee*

Order of Dismissal : December 20, 2022

Order Denying Rehearing: January 3, 2023

U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia

No. 1:21-cv-02526

Lorraine Bond, *Plaintiff*, v. Office of the Attorney
General of the United States, et al., *Defendants*

Final Order: September 22, 2022

U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia

No1:21-cv-01430

Lorraine Bond, *Plaintiff*, v. Office of the Attorney
General of the United States, et al., *Defendants*

Date of Final Order: September 22, 2022

U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia

No. 1:21-cv-00550

Lorraine Bond, *Plaintiff*, v. Office of the Attorney
General of the United States, et al., *Defendants*

Date of Final Order: March 8, 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTIONS PRESENTED	i
PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS	v
LIST OF PROCEEDINGS	vi
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	xii
OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION.....	1
CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS STATUTES, AND JUDICIAL RULES.....	1
A. Constitutional Provisions	1
B. Statutes	2
C. Judicial Rules	2
RULE 20 STATEMENT	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	4
A. Fact of Law.....	4
B. Judicial Notice	6
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION	7
I. CIVIL RICO ACTS / OR OTHERWISE PREDICATE ATS BASED ON THE BOMBS' PRODUCT LIABILITY	7
A. Civil RICO	7
B. Civil RICO Prima Facie Elements	8

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Continued

	Page
C. Enterprise	8
D. Causation	9
E. Standings	9
F. Holding	9
CONCLUSION.....	10

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Continued

Page

APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS**OPINIONS AND ORDERS**

Order Constituting the Final Judgment, U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia (February 26, 2024)	1a
Order, U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia (February 26, 2024)	3a
Order, U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit (December 20, 2022)	7a
Memorandum Opinion, U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia (September 22, 2022).....	9a
Memorandum Opinion, U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia (September 22, 2022).....	12a

STATUTORY PROVISIONS

Statutory Provisions	15a
----------------------------	-----

OTHER DOCUMENTS

Lorraine Bond Affidavit in Support a Memorandum Of Law (September 30, 2024) ..	16a
Letter from the D.C. Circuit Court Executive (September 18, 2024).....	17a
Waiver of Summons (October 16, 2024).....	19a
Docket Excerpt from 1986 Lawsuit.....	22a
Photo: The MOVE Bombing Published in the Philadelphia Inquirer.....	26a

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Continued

Page

1927 News Article Showing America Was Sold to Five Billionaires	27a
Photo: My Husband and Our Child	28a
Photo: MOVE Children Bones on Display	29a
Photo: Aftermath of the MOVE Bombing	30a

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

CASES

<i>Bivens v. Six unknown</i> , 403 U.S. 388 (1971)	5
<i>Bond v. United States</i> , 681 F.3d 149 (3d Cir. 2012).....	4, 5
<i>Chainey v. City of Philadelphia et. al.</i> , Civil Action.03-06248-CF (E.D. Pa. Dec. 1, 2005)	5
<i>Keely v. Croft</i> , 2015 Ohio 2096, Final Decision on the Merits.....	5
<i>Mapp v. City of Philadelphia et al.</i> , Civil Action. 85-3123	5
<i>Nat'l Org. for Women, Inc. v. Scheidler</i> , 510 U.S. 249 (1994)	8
<i>Roe v. Wade</i> , 410 U.S. 113 (1973)	8
<i>Romona Africa v. City of Philadelphia. et al.</i> , No.87-2768 (master file no.85-2745).....	5, 8, 10

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

U.S. Const. amend. V.....	i, ii
U.S. Const. amend. XIII	6
U.S. Const. amend. XIV.....	i, ii
U.S. Const. art. III, § 1	1
U.S. Const. art. III, § 2	1

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

Page

STATUTES

1 U.S.C. § 106(b)	6
18 U.S.C. § 229.....	7
18 U.S.C. § 229(a)	7
18 U.S.C. § 229f(1)	7
18 U.S.C. § 229f(1)(7).....	7
18 U.S.C. § 229f(1)(8).....	7
18 U.S.C. § 241.....	iii
18 U.S.C. § 242.....	2
18 U.S.C. § 844(h)	iii, 2, 8
18 U.S.C. § 1651.....	2, 4
18 U.S.C. § 1961.....	9
18 U.S.C. § 1962(a)	8
18 U.S.C. § 1962(c).....	8
18 U.S.C. § 1962(d)	8
28 U.S.C. § 1391(e).....	ii
28 U.S.C. § 1651.....	1
28 U.S.C. § 1361.....	ii
34 U.S.C. § 12601.....	2
Ku Klux Klan Act of 1871.....	2
Title VIII Fair Housing Act of 1968	2

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

Page

JUDICIAL RULES

Fed. R. App. P. 4	2
Fed. R. Civ. P. 15 (b)	i
Fed. R. Civ. P. 1908	2
Sup. Ct. R. 20	1
Sup. Ct. R. 24	2
Sup. Ct. R. 42	2



OPINIONS BELOW

The Opinion of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, in case number 1:23-cv-00823, dated February 26, 2024 is included at App.1a. The Opinion of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, dated December 20, 2022, is included at App.7a.



JURISDICTION

In aid of this Court's appellate jurisdiction, the jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1651, the All Writs Act, which authorizes the Supreme Court and all courts established by Congress to issue writs necessary or appropriate in aid of their respective jurisdictions and agreeable to the usages and principles of law. This petition filed under the auspices of Sup. Ct. R. 20.



CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS STATUTES, AND JUDICIAL RULES

A. Constitutional Provisions

U.S. Const. art. III, sec. 1

Establishing the Jurisdiction of the Supreme Court

U.S. Const. art. III, sec. 2

Exception Clause and Congressional Control over Appellate Jurisdiction by Congress.

Note: *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 137 (1803) established the doctrine of judicial review.

B. Statutes

18 U.S.C. § 844(h)

Federal Explosive Act

18 U.S.C. § 242

Deprivation of Rights Under Color of the Law

18 U.S.C. § 1964(c)

Civil Conspiracy & Product Liability

28 U.S.C. § 1651

All Writs Act

34 U.S.C § 12601

Causes of Action (Pattern and Practices)

Ku Klux Klan Act of 1871

Conspiracy & Product Liability 1964(c)

42 U.S.C. § 1981

Civil Rights of 1866 (Unlimited Liability)

Civil P. Code of 1908

Res Judicata - to stop and prevent re-examining a case that's already been decided.

Fair Housing Act of 1968, Title VIII

Criminal interference with housing

C. Judicial Rules

Fed. R. App. P. 4

Sup. Ct. R. 24

Brief on the Merits

Sup. Ct. R. 42

Violations, Interest, and Damage



RULE 20 STATEMENT

Petitioner seeks the issuance of a Writ of Mandamus to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia directing the D.C. Circuit to order the compensation to petitioners for property damage, equitable relief, psychological harm, and loss of livelihood.

Petitioner submits that she has exhausted all appeals remedies and has no other recourse but to request that the honorable court to employ its discretion sparingly exercised and remand this case back to the District of Columbia circuit for directed judgment in favor of Petitioners or in the alternative to order a full hearing to determine the amount of compensation. Petitioner has previously pursued justice in the D.C. Circuit Court, and subsequently in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, but has been denied appeal for alleged res judicata. In addition, the D.C. Circuit previously concluded, "on its own motion, that oral argument will not assist the court in this case." This undeniably demonstrates the D.C. Circuit's hostility to the petitioner's case. Thus, the last remaining supervisory authority is the United States Supreme Court.

❁

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Comes Now, LORRAINE BOND, in special appearance as a Free Woman of this Republic who seeks immediate emergency action of this court of a writ of certiorari petition and invokes the jurisdiction of a precedent case of settled law before this court and to seek justice on the "judgment on the merits pursuant to title 28 U.S.C.A., section 1651.

The Executive Branch And all levels of this Republic Judiciary Officials Violated Rule of Law and acquiesced and conspired with government officials. The Federal Procedures Appellate rule 4 that quotes in contrast, an appeal should be made as a "Matter of Right". This higher court must review this case from the trial court judgment in the Ed. Of Pa. and correct this error of law. The Circuit Executive, Department of Justice / Civil rights division, FBI, and other government and state officials acquiesce and make a mockery of the Rule of Law that was found by your fore-father, now this action broaden a wider conspiracy element which leads to overt acts and aiding and abetting continuum of conspiracy against rights to this civil action for the last 39 years. The government is using *res judicata* as a prevailing defense, *See: Bond v. United States*, 681 F.3d 149, reversed and remanded, affirm or modify this decision of the and remand to lower courts for summary judgment!

A. Fact of Law

That the respondents City of Philadelphia, PA has in fact been convicted and the DuPont's products Tovex along with the C-4 that was controlled by the

U.S. Government/"ATF." /FBI were also convicted in this same matter see: *Romona Africa v. City of Philadelphia. et al.* case No.87-2768 (master file no.85-2745) was consolidated for all purposes (see other related cases adjudicated). *Mapp v. City of Philadelphia et al.* Civil Action 85-3123.

Chainey v. City of Philadelphia et. al. civil action. 03-06248-CF. Casemine. The bombing of Osage Ave. in the City of Philadelphia, PA was adjudicated/or otherwise put to rest. Moreover the federal government allocated \$41,000,000.00 to the City of Philadelphia, to rebuild the burning down of property, business and the known residents of the 61 home owners never got fair compensation of their property and forcing the people out their homes from this original action and now the courts of this country is allowing convicted felons to conspire again with the judges that oversaw this cases for the last 39 year and shut the door on plaintiff. These defendants along with the courts have broken the Code of Ethics, the Rule of Law Doctrine, "Breach of Contract" and "Taking Clause". These respondents should be under investigation for the evil acts of their past and present conduct for stealing, abuse of federal powers see *United States v. Bond* that the United States Supreme Court reversed on Ms. Carol-Anne-Bond which case was decided and considered on its standing of abuse of power. It's been held and made crystal clear in the case of *Bivens v. Six unknown* narcotic officers, that whenever the government, state or federal violate and wrong a citizen, that citizen enjoys the right to litigate this issue before a federal court, in summation.

B. Judicial Notice

Lorraine Bond, comes in special appearance as Sui Juris and stands along with the indigenous people of color respectfully requesting that this court issue an order for summary judgment and to grant this National Permanent Injunction on the merit docket of a prima facie that has been settled! Please note on record that the court are in violation of the doctrine of Stare Decisis and with their unethical behavior on the Rule of Law, along with their actions to involve themselves with the defendants and government officials which violates the Monument Clause from the Original 13th Amendment that was ratified on December 6, 1865 that abolished slavery. This serious challenge of this Constitution causes a conflict by allowing them to amend the original 13th Amendment to the 3/5ths Compromise that was founded on 1787 to enslave the black population 400 years and counting. Still to this modern day we can't get justice in these same courts of this republic which is evil that also has created a conflict of the Constitution and it caused questions because slavery was never abolished from the to keep the indigenous people of color in bondage which violate what your fore-father's wrote in law. Moreover for these reasons we will ask the courts to eradicate or/ permanently removing the 3/5ths Compromise out of the Constitution pursuant to the 1 U.S.C. § 106(b). The courts and defendants should be held for violation of the doctrine of stare decisis, along with civil and criminal liability to be taken seriously and give the proper Disrobement, Sanctions, and Compensate damages for its wrongs by said respondents. This Democracy is corrupted and it keeps poor people in slavery and bondages.

DuPont de Nemours, Inc. and defendants violated chemical weapons convention Implementation Act of 1998, overly broad federal laws. 229 ("Section 229"), which forbids the use of any chemical that "can cause death, temporary incapacitation or permanent harm to humans or animals were not intended for a peaceful / purpose, 229(a) 229f(1)(7);(8).



REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

I. Civil RICO Acts / Or Otherwise Predicate Acts Based on the Bombs' Product Liability

The defendants in the above caption have committed a conflict of the Law of the Land and the hidden truth of the C-4 and Tovex that was used in the bombing of Osage Ave. in the City of Brotherly Love in the year 1985 where the constitution was founded. Some of the most evil acts in this country's history were violated by State and Federal Offices. This warrants the federal civil Rico statutes and to take judicial notice on this matter for the reasons stated herein to below for racketeering, without an economic purpose.

A. Civil RICO

A Civil Rico claim is rooted in the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act, a federal law designed to combat organized crime and corruption. These tactics empower individuals or businesses to seek legal remedies for damage inflicted by racketeering activities by Government, State officials, Judicial Branch of this government, Federal & State Judges to

ignore and to conspire against the Rule of Law that the forefather left embedded in this country's constitution. See *Nat'l Org. for Women, Inc. v. Scheidler*, 510 U.S. 249, 262 (1994)

I will join the women's movement with the National Organization for females that sued a coalition of anti-abortion groups called the Pro-Life Action Network (Plan) under the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organization (RICO) Act! (Now) this body of government and courts violates a precedent case of law with my civil action along with *Roe v. Wade* under Title 7 & 9 under the gender of a female of this country. This court and defendants have violated a nationwide conspiracy to abstract women's access to abortion clinics through a pattern of racketeering activity including the actual or implied threats of violence against the people of color. (Now) defendants and courts violated the RICO Sections 1962(a), (c) and (d) and Federal Explosive Act 844(h).

B. Civil RICO Prima Facie Elements

That the materials of the U.S. government and the E&I Dupont's C-4 and Tovex were found liable indirectly but never found guilty directly of their products. see *Romona Africa vs. The City of Philadelphia supra*, of the bombing of Osage Ave. in 1985.

C. Enterprise

All the defendants mentioned committed RICO Enterprise by individual, partnership, corporation, association, or any other legal entity, and an union or group of individuals associated in fact, has committed Fraud, Obstruction, Extortion, Embezzlement, Threats, Bribery and Conspiracy against the rule of law. This

enterprise activity has been going on for 39 years of illegal bombs used on a black neighborhoods. See: 18 U.S.C. § 1961, predicate acts.

D. Causation

This direct causal relation between the defendant's participation in the enterprise activity and racketeering was a proximate cause of their harm for the nature of the product's use in the bombing of Osage that was ruled against them by a competent court for the destruction of our business and properties along with injuries.

E. Standings

This serious nature of the materials/or otherwise a bomb that had C-4 which is controlled by military and Tovex that was controlled by E&I Dupont Inc. to conspire and to be used upon civilian population which is unlawful. These two product have been adjudicated indirectly but not Directly.

F. Holding

The United States Supreme Court held that organizations without an economic motive can detrimentally "affect interstate or foreign commerce," satisfying the RICO definition of a racketeering "enterprise". An "enterprise does not have to be an economic organization or a principally criminal organization to trigger the RICO act. See The United States Supreme Court strike down Chevron doctrine, curtailing power of federal agencies.



CONCLUSION

This case can't go back on the track because it has been put to rest and is off the track. The Ed. of Pa. and the late Judge Pollack ruled on this issue and consolidated this matter for all purposes. see *Romona Africa supra* Judgment bar.

Respectfully submitted,

Lorraine Bond
Sui Juris
2289 Levy Road
Hardeeville, SC 29927
(843) 288-1045
lwbond0072@gmail.com

January 3, 2025