No.

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

Alejandro Evaristo Perez,

Pro Se Petitioner

v.

Disney Corporation; The Walt Disney Company; Disney Enterprises, Incorporated; Disney ABC Incorporated; et al.

Responders

To The United States Court Of Appeals For The Fifth Circuit (#23-20432)

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

PRO SE PETITIONER:
ALEJANDRO EVARISTO PEREZ
9233 WESTHEIMER, #405
HOUSTON, TX 77063
(214) 762-0075
alejandro.evaristo.perez@gmail.com

RESPONDER:
SCOTT JONES
2200 ROSS AVENUE, SUITE 2800
DALLAS, TX 75201
(214) 740-8761
sjones@lockelord.com

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

Since the US Supreme Court already accepted the crimes of the defaulted Responders in SCOTUS 23-340, the question is "Whether the US Supreme Court wants to mediate a settlement of $29,744,550,000, apologies, and copyrights purchases, or the Court orders the Disney Villains to pay the $29,744,550,000, retire Fallen Judges, and let the Hero Alejandro Evaristo Perez keep his own copyrights in order save time, avoid paper, and reduce drama in this Double Jeopardy case? The choices presented are between politely forcing the Federal Judges to do their "Umpire" jobs, or clean the Judicial System by punishing conspirators and retiring Fallen Judges who encourage infringement, conspiracy, and piracy of copyrights. Below are the questions that the 5th Circuit Judges never answered: "Why do the Conspirators just buy the Pro Se Party's US copyrights via royalty agreement and depublished or monetize at will?", "Why is Judge Ellison failing to protect the resident copyright

holders who entitled to any Motion for Summary Judgment in their own jurisdiction?", "Why are our Judge Ellison choosing to violate legal precedence?", "Why is Judge Ellison pretending that the Responders do not operate in the TXSD Jurisdiction?", "Why is Judge Ellison pretending to be our Honorable Charles Eskridge by deciding fraudulent motions addressed to Judge Charles Eskridge?", "Why is Judge Ellison determining venue choices for total strangers without any legal contracts without any Change of Venue?", and "Is Judge Ellison part of the unnecessary conspiracy to restrict trade and stalled the copyright holder's US Code 17 rights?". And now, we have new questions like "Why are Appeal Judges refusing to talk about agreed-on case law first cited by the Responders?" and "Why do the Pirate Appeal Judges cite irrelevant disputed case law to hijack the arguments, when none of their citations changes the fact the copyright holder is still owns the copyrights in any US jurisdiction and protected in any US jurisdiction?"

LIST OF PROCEEDINGS

US Supreme Court

23-340 (Defaulted) and 23M2 (SCOTUS Rule 40 Violation)

Alejandro Evaristo Perez, Pro Se Petitioner. The Walt Disney Company, Defaulted Responder

Date of Final Opinion: December 11 2023

———†———

US Court Of Appeals For The Fifth Circuit

23-20432 (Double Jeopardy) and 22-20084 (First Jeopardy)

Date of Final Opinion: April 25, 2024 and April 26 2023

———†———

Texas Southern District (TXSD) Federal Court

4:21-cv-00765 (Original Case)

Date of Final Opinion: February 09, 2022

———†———

California Central District (CACD) Federal Court

2:21-cv-03490-JFW-E (sued at the request of Responders)

Date of Final Opinion: July 01, 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Continued

APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

US CODES

US FEDERAL CASES

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

US FEDERAL CASES

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Alejandro Evaristo Perez, the Pro Se Petitioner and copyright holder in his own jurisdiction, file a petition for a writ of certiorari to reverse the second unjust judgments of Fallen Judges hiding behind a fraudulent 4th Motion to Dismiss. The Court must enforce the agreed-on case law and Codes in the TABLE OF AUTHORITIES to favor the Pro Se Petitioner's pleadings based on the choices presented.

———†———

OPINION BELOW

The opinion of the Appeal Judges (App. 1a) in the Fifth Circuit is reported at 5th Cir. 23-20432 and 5th Cir. 22-20084 as mentioned in the Table of Authorities. The opinion of the district court (App. 7a) is reported at TXSD 4:21-cv-00765.

———†———

JURISDICTION & INTERESTED PARTIES

The Fifth Circuit entered 2nd judgment on April 25 2024, 1st judgment on April 26 2023, and the Pro Se Party submitted a Pro Se case letter in lieu of petition for panel

rehearing and rehearing en banc on May 8, 2024 (App. 14a) by informing the 5th Circuit with intentions to petition the US Supreme Court like in SCOTUS 23-340 and based on their "Pro Se" guidelines, which state "*Pro Se Cases. If you were unsuccessful in the district court and/or on appeal, and are considering filing a petition for certiorari in the United States Supreme Court, you do not need to file a motion for stay of mandate under Fed. R. App. P. 41. The issuance of the mandate does not affect the time, or your right, to file with the Supreme Court.*" With this "Pro Se Right-To-File" clause granted by the 5th Circuit Court, the Pro Se Petitioner is acting on this clause and thus filing this official PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI to the US Supreme Court. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. Section 1254(1) "Courts of appeals; Certiorari; Certified Questions". US Army Officer Alejandro Evaristo Perez is the Pro Se Petitioner and requesting Rule 40 be enforced when filing his MOTION FOR LEAVE TO

PROCEED AS A VETERAN. The Pro Se Petitioner is still politely offering the US Supreme Court to refund the $600 to the Pro Se Petitioner, friendly apologize for their multiple Rule 40 violations in "Perez vs LinkedIn" (Case No. 22-726 and No. 21M120.) and "Perez vs Disney" (Case No. 23-340 and No. 23M2.) IAW US Supreme Court Rule 29.6 "corporate disclosure statement" (CERTIFICATION AND NOTICE OF INTERESTED PARTIES) was finally validated on 08 June 2021 in CACD 2:21-cv-03490-JFW-E (Docket#34) with a Certificate of Service, the Responder, "The Walt Disney Company" corporation, declared that "The Walt Disney Company states that is has no parent corporation and that no publicly held corporation owns more than 10% of The Walt Disney Company's stock.". IAW FRCP 15 "Matter of Course" and once validated in the Federal Courts, the Pro Se Petitioner filed the 1st Amended Complaint in the docket for case TXSD 4:21-cv-00765, which our Honorable Judge Charles Eskridge accepted and Parties agreed on, when our

Honorable Judge Charles Eskridge recused himself on 24 January 2022. In fact, our Honorable Judge Charles Eskridge added both "THE WALT DISNEY COMPANY" and "DISNEY CORPORATION" on his order, which inspired the Pro Se Petitioner to punish more unethical Disney Villains via new amended complaints and the use of the "et la" concept. The TXSD Judges and 5th Circuit Judges accepted different amended complaints (FRCP 15). FYI, the copyrighted novels had disclaimers to include parody.

———†———

STATUTES & CASES PROVISIONS INVOLVED

17 U.S.C. Chapter 5

Copyright Infringements and Remedies

> "§ 501 (a) Anyone who violates any of the exclusive rights of the copyright owner as provided by sections 106 through 122 or of the author as provided in section 106A(a), or who imports copies or phonorecords into the United States in violation of section 602, is an

infringer of the copyright or right of the author, as the case may be." The Pro Se Petitioner owns the copyrights and submitted the copyrights to evidence, while the Responders do not and conspired a shutdown in the Amazon platform via false claims.

15 U.S.C. Chapter 1 § 1

Trusts, etc., in restraint of trade illegal; penalty

"Every contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations, is declared to be illegal. Every person who shall make any contract or engage in any combination or conspiracy hereby declared to be illegal shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and, on conviction thereof, shall be punished by fine not exceeding $100,000,000 if a corporation, or, if any other person, $1,000,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding 10 years, or by both said punishments, in the discretion of the court."

28 U.S.C. § 1654

Appearance personally or by Counsel

> "In all courts of the United States, the parties may plead and conduct their own cases personally or by counsel as, by the rules of such courts, respectively, are permitted to manage and conduct cause therein."

18 U.S.C. § 1341

Frauds and Swindles

> "Whoever, having devised or intending to devise any scheme or artifice to defraud, or for obtaining money or property (ex. copyrights are intellectual property) by means of false or fraudulent pretenses (falsely claiming to own those copyrights), representations, or promises, or to sell, dispose of, loan, exchange, alter, give away, distribute (or stop distribution in Amazon platform), supply, or furnish or procure for unlawful use any counterfeit or spurious coin, obligation, security, or other article, or anything represented to

be or intimated (like legal bullying) or held out to be such counterfeit or spurious article, for the purpose of executing such scheme (like a unauthorized shutdown in the Amazon platform of the Pro Se Petitioner's copyrighted novels) or artifice or attempting so to do (like fraudulent a motion to dismiss addressed to a recused judge), places in any post office or authorized depository for mail matter, any matter or thing whatever to be sent or delivered by the Postal Service (stealing mail), or deposits or causes to be deposited any matter or thing whatever to be sent or delivered by any private or commercial interstate carrier (or stop the Amazon drivers from distributing the Pro Se Petitioner's copyrighted novels via shutdown), or takes or receives therefrom, any such matter or thing, or knowingly causes to be delivered by mail or such carrier according to the direction thereon, or at the place at which it is directed to be delivered by the

person to whom it is addressed, any such matter or thing, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both. If the violation occurs in relation to, or involving any benefit authorized, transported, transmitted (the "The Walt Disney Company" using emails to falsely claim ownership of Alejandro Evaristo Perez's copyrighted novels), transferred, disbursed, or paid in connection

with, a presidentially declared major disaster or emergency (as those terms are defined in section 102 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122)), or affects a financial institution, such person shall be fined not more than $1,000,000 or imprisoned not more than 30 years, or both.

18 U.S.C. § 1519

Destruction, alteration, or falsification of records in...

"Whoever knowingly alters (like closing a 'Disney Store' in the Houston Galleria within the timeframe of the cases [Houston Chronicle Article, "Disney to close Galleria store in next few weeks", 21SEP2021]), destroys, mutilates, conceals, covers up, falsifies, or makes a false entry in any record, document, or tangible object with the intent to impede, obstruct, or influence the investigation or proper administration of any matter within the jurisdiction of any department (like trying to reduce subsidiaries' TXSD jurisdiction presence by closing the Disney Galleria Store) or agency of the United States or any case filed under title 11, or in relation to or contemplation of any such matter or case, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both."

18 U.S.C. § 1621

Perjury

"Whoever— 1) having taken an oath before a competent tribunal, officer, or person, in any case in which a law of the United States authorizes an oath to be administered, that he will testify, declare, depose, or certify truly, or that any written testimony (like the emails between Amazon Inc., "The Walt Disney Company", and Alejandro Evaristo Perez where Pro Se Petitioner attached his copyrights files), declaration (like an Unsigned Magistrate writing on the Federal Docket), deposition (like filing a late incomplete Motion to Dismiss as "valid"), or certificate by him subscribed, is true, willfully and contrary to such oath states or subscribes any material matter which he does not believe to be true; or (2)in any declaration, certificate, verification, or statement under penalty of perjury as permitted under section 1746 of title 28, United States Code, willfully subscribes as true any material matter which he does

not believe to be true; is guilty of perjury and shall, except as otherwise expressly provided by law, be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than five years, or both. This section is applicable whether the statement or subscription is made within or without the United States."

Alejandro Evaristo Perez v. The Walt Disney Company,

Supreme Court, No. 23-340

Supreme Court, No. 23M2

After several unpatriotic Rule 40 violations, the Pro Se Party and the US Supreme Court finally agreed the Responder failed to respond, that the unresponsive Responder defaulted by failing to provide any explain their criminal actions, and the Court agreed with the statement of IF THE SUPREME COURT DENIES THIS RIGHTEOUS PETITION, THE PRO SE PETITIONER WILL ASSUME THAT THE UNETHICAL RESPONDER AND THE FALLEN

JUDGE' WRONGFUL ACTIONS ARE VIOLATING 17 U.S.C. CHAPTER 5 "COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENTS", VIOLATING 15 U.S.C. CHAPTER 1 § 1 "CONSPIRACY", VIOLATING 18 U.S.C. § 1341 "FRAUDS AND SWINDLES", VIOLATING 18 U.S.C. § 1621 "PERJURY", AND VIOLATING THE ONLY AGREED-ON CASELAW OF "ROSSI V. MOTION PICTURE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA INC., 9TH CIRCUIT, NO. 03-16034 (2004), THAT THE SUPREME COURT DOES NOT WANT TO WASTE THEIR TIME ON FELONS, AND THAT THE PRO SE HAS EVERY RIGHT TO HAND THE FELONS TO THEIR RESPECTIVE DISTRICT ATTORNEYS TO BEGIN CRIMINAL PROSECUTION FOR SUCH VIOLATIONS."

Rossi V. Motion Picture Association Of America Inc.,

9th Circuit, No. 03-16034 (2004)

The Courts favored Motion Picture Association Of America Inc., who is the copyright holder in their own jurisdiction like the Alejandro Evaristo Perez, the Pro Se Petitioner and copyright holder in his own TXSD jurisdiction. The Courts approved the resident moving party of the Summary Judgment (FRCP 56), because there were no disputes of material of facts and the movant owned the copyright. No IIED claims for infringers nor conspirators. Only copyright holders can claim IIED, which is been claimed by Alejandro Evaristo Perez in the District Courts." This is the only agreed-on caselaw by all Parties. The Responders first cited this multijurisdictional case in CACD 2:21-cv-03490-JFW-E on 08 June 2021 (Docket#32, Page 4, 11). Both "Motion Picture Association Of America Inc." and Pro Se Petitioner filed Motions for Summary Judgments (FRCP 56) in their local Federal Courts.

Alejandro Evaristo Perez v. LinkedIn Corporation,

Supreme Court, No. 22-726

Supreme Court, No. 21M120

"After several unpatriotic Rule 40 violations, the Pro Se Party and the US Supreme Court finally agreed that the unethical actions of the Chinese Communist Party traitors and Fallen Judges was treason, and not Anti-SLAPP Laws. The petition was written with the wording of "IF THE SUPREME COURT DENIES THIS RIGHTEOUS PETITION, THE PRO SE PETITIONER WILL ASSUME THAT THE UNETHICAL RESPONDER AND THE FALLEN JUDGES' WRONGFUL ACTIONS ARE FEDERAL TREASON, THAT THE SUPREME COURT DOES NOT WANT TO WASTE THEIR TIME ON TRAITORS, AND THAT THE PRO SE HAS EVERY RIGHT TO HAND THE TRAITORS TO THEIR RESPECTIVE DISTRICT ATTORNEYS TO BEGIN CRIMINIAL PROSECUTION FOR TREASON ON

TREASONOUS US CIVILIANS." The similar "Denied" clause in that petition is been implemented to this petition to force the US Supreme Court to make necessary tough decisions.

Schneider v. TRW, Inc.,

9th Circuit, 938 F. 2d 986, 992, (1991)

"4 Elements Criteria for Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress (IIED). (1) the defendant must act intentionally or recklessly; (2) the defendant's conduct must be extreme and outrageous; and (3) the conduct must be the cause (4) of severe emotional distress." The Pro Se Petitioner is extreme distressed by the Disney Villains who refuse to purchase the Pro Se Petioner's copyrights. Instead, the cheap Disney Villains are creating more chaos, misleading Amazon Inc., filing fraudulent motions, stealing mail, etc.. The paperwork and problems are 100% responsibility of the unethical Responders' conspiracy and the Fallen

Judges who are too cheap and pathetic to respect copyrights while enjoying the disrespect of the Pro Se Petitioner. The Pro Se Petitioner fear for his own safety due the evil actions from the Disney Villains.

Haines v. Kerner,

Supreme Court, No. 70-5025 (1972)

"Pro Se Party's pleadings, requests, and motions should be entertained by all US Federal Judges."

Resnick v. Hayes,

9th Circuit, 213 F.3d 443, 447 (2000)

"Pro Se Party must be construed liberally."

McKinney v. De Bord

9th Circuit, 507 F.2d 501, 504, (1974)

"Every reasonable or warranted factual inference in the Pro Se Party favor."

Faretta v. California

Supreme Court, No. 422 U.S. 806 (1975)

"Pro Se Parties (ex. criminal defendants) have both a constitutional and statutory right to self-representation in any Federal Court."

USA v. Automated Medical Laboratories,

4th Circuit, 770 F.2d 399 (1985)

"Parent corporations can be convicted of subsidiary's actions, even in attempts to disassociate or escape-goat employees."

USA v. Cincotta,

1st Circuit, 689 F.2d 238, 241-42 (1982)

"criminal liability imposed on the corporations where the agents are acting within the scope of his employment."

State Of Oklahoma v Shriver,

US Supreme Court, 21-985 (2022)

Sample format booklet offered by US Supreme Clerk Redmond Barnes to follow on 30 November 2022. The

US Supreme Court has accepted other formats is proof of corruption and violations of Pro Se caselaw. Regardless, the same booklet format used in SCOTUS 22-726, 21M120, 23-340, 23M2, and this case.

International Shoe Co. V. Washington,

Sup. Ct., 326 U.S. 310, No. 107 (1945)

"Federal Courts have 'Long-arm Statute' Personal Jurisdiction over any self-proclaimed 'out-the-state' Defendant that operates in their respective jurisdictions." This multijurisdictional caselaw is disputed by the Responders, which is why the focus in the agreed-on caselaw of "Rossi V. Motion Picture Association Of America Inc." 9th Circuit, No. 03-16034 (2004), where the focus is the copyright holder in their own jurisdiction like the Pro Se Petitioner is the copyright holder in their own TXSD jurisdiction.

Benton v. Maryland,

Sup. Ct., 395 U.S. 784, No. 201 (1969)

"Civic Double Jeopardy is allowed. Restrictions to Double Jeopardy only applied to the US Federal Government."

USA v. One Assortment of 89 Firearms,

Sup. Ct., 465 U.S. 354, No. 82-1047 (1984)

"The SCOTUS held that the prohibition on double jeopardy extends to civil sanctions which are applied in a manner that is punitive in nature. A Pro Se Party's constants polite requests to peacefully settle and to wait patiently on his SCOTUS 23-340 petitions are NOT punitive in nature."

USA v. Ursery,

Sup. Ct., 518 U.S. 267, No. 95-345 (1996)

"Civil forfeitures always constitute 'punishment' for double jeopardy purposes. The Pro Se Party's peaceful requests for settlement and offering to wait on the SCOTUS petitions from a prior case is NOT civil forfeitures nor constitute as civil forfeitures"

Sup. Ct. R. 40

Rule 40. Veterans, Seamen, and Military Cases.

"A veteran suing under any provision of the law excepting veterans from the payment of fees or court costs, may proceed without prepayment of frees or costs of furnishing security therefore and may (optional) file a motion for leave to proceed on papers...". Pro Se Party is an Honorable US War Veteran and an Honorable US Army Officer, and filed two motions; which the Court intentionally rejected and insulted the US War Hero.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(1)(A)(i)

"21-Day Deadline"

"(a) Time to Serve a Responsive Pleading.(1) In General. Unless another time is specified by this rule or a federal statute, the time for serving a responsive pleading is as follows: (A) A defendant must serve an

answer: (i) within 21 days after being served with the summons and complaint; or..." In the TXSD, the Responders filed a late incomplete 1st Motion to Dismiss without a proposed order.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a) & (b)

"Amendments Before Trial, During, and After Trial"

(a) Time to Serve a Responsive Pleading. (1) In General. Unless another time is specified by this rule or a federal statute, the time for serving a responsive pleading is as follows: (A) A defendant must serve an answer: (i) within 21 days after being served with the summons and complaint; or (a) Amendments Before Trial. (1) Amending as a Matter of Course. A party may amend its pleading once as a matter of course within: (A) 21 days after serving it, or (B) if the pleading is one to which a responsive pleading is required, 21 days after service of a responsive pleading or 21 days after service of a motion under

Rule 12(b), (e), or (f), whichever is earlier. (2) Other Amendments. In all other cases, a party may amend its pleading only with the opposing party's written consent or the court's leave. The court should freely give leave when justice so requires." The 1st Amended Complaint required the Responders to file a 2nd Motion to Dismiss to match "The Walt Disney Company" naming convention. The Responders failed to file the 2nd Motion to Dismiss in the TXSD after the Amended Complaint was accepted. Then, filed a fraudulent 4th Motion to Dismiss addressed to our Honorable Judge Charles Eskridge, who is recused.

———†———

INTRODUCTION

The Pro Se Petitioner is the victim of a very unnecessary conspiracy to restrict trade against his copyrighted novels by cheap unethical conspirators (the Responders) in the Amazon e-commerce platform and its

distribution. The US Supreme Court already found the Disney Villains guilt by default in SCOTUS case 23-340 via the denial clause in order not waste time on conspirators. However, the Pro Se Petitioner is still offering to peacefully sell his multiple related copyrights (ex. "The Real Lord Vader: The Destroyer of Star Wars", "Empire of God", etc...) to the cheap unethical conspirators to end these multijurisdictional Federal Cases in order to avoid further IIED by the Appellee(s), avoid the criminal prosecution of the conspirators, avoid more unnecessary paperwork, and offering peaceful retirement of Fallen Judges. In contrast, the cheap unethical conspirators are playing legal mind-games to create chaos with a fraudulent "Motion to Dismiss" to a recused judge, failed Responses to Summary Judgments (FRCP 56), false Jurisdiction arguments, constantly citing disputed case law to avoid talking about agreed-on case law, "name" games, tampering with evidence (ex. closing the "Disney Store" in the Houston Gallery Store), stealing the

Pro Se Petitioner's certified mail, and utilizing their brands and resources to misguide an Unsigned Magistrate Judge, stall the TXSD Docket, stall the CACD Docket, and stall the Fifth Circuit Docket in order to further inflict IIED on the Pro Se Party, who offered to peacefully sell the copyrights. The only thing that all Parties can truly agree on is the legal case of "Rossi V. Motion Picture Association Of America Inc., 391 F.3d 1000, 1007 (9th Cir. 2004)", because the unethical conspirators first cited the legal case of "Rossi V. Motion Picture Association Of America Inc.," in the CACD Court (CACD 2:21-cv-03490-JFW-E), and the Pro Se Party agreed. Yes, the Pro Se Party agreed, because the Pro Se Party is the "Motion Picture Association Of America Inc." in both local jurisdiction and in copyright ownership. The original decision favored "Motion Picture Association Of America Inc." and so the Court protected the local copyright holder in their local jurisdiction against external infringers, external conspirators, and Fallen Judges. The Pro Se Petitioner's

local jurisdiction is the TXSD, because he lives in the TXSD. Therefore, the TXSD Federal Court must favor and protect the Pro Se Petitioner, who is the local copyright holder in his own jurisdiction like "Motion Picture Association Of America Inc.". Instead following legal precedence, the Fallen Judge Ellison and Unsigned Magistrate Judge Sheldon broke and dishonored the Honorable Federal Judges in "Rossi V. Motion Picture Association Of America Inc., 391 F.3d 1000, 1007 (9th Cir. 2004)". The Fallen Judge Ellison and Unsigned Magistrate Judge Sheldon ignored the resident copyright holder's "Motion for Summary Judgment" in his own jurisdiction citing this agreed-on case law. The Fallen Judge Ellison made two unjust decision to choose a fake jurisdiction argument in a fraudulent Motion to Dismiss not even address to him, which violates FRCP Rules, and violates the only agreed-on caselaw by both the US Supreme Court and the 9th Circuit Appeal Court. Even worst, the unjust decisions based on Unsigned Magistrate Judge's

misguided recommendations, who openly and knowingly violated 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) repeatedly and dishonor our good Honorable Charles Eskridge's decision to recuse himself to save his misguided Magistrate Judge and create a "WIN-WIN-WIN" situation for all parties. Instead of following Honorable Charles Eskridge's good example, the Fallen Judges played illegal games by intentionally ignoring the Pro Se Party's multiple Default Judgments IAW FRCP 55, Motions for Summary Judgements IAW FRCP 56, and Opening Brief's agreed-on case law by hijacking the narrative with disputed irrelevant case law. The Fallen Judges' corruption was further displayed, when the Disney Villains failed to file timely motions to dismiss addressed to the correct judge, failed to file complete opposing motions, ignore the recusal order, failed to respond a Writ of Certiorari in SCOTUS 23-340, and/or fail to follow agreed-on caselaw first cited by the Disney Villains themselves. All these Disney Villains failure went without any legal

repercussions by the Fallen Judges in TXSD Court and the Fallen Judges in 5th Circuit, while these Fallen Judges intentionally ignoring the US Supreme Court's SCOTUS case 23-340 and the 9th Circuit Appeal Court. In order words, the TXSD Federal Court and 5th Circuit Appeal are vowing and submitting to dumb-asses in Mickey Mouse hats, who cannot even make a logical complete motion with a propose order on time to the correct judge. The Pro Se Petitioner turned to the US Supreme Court to stop this unnecessary conspiracy to restrict trade against his copyrighted novel, and politely correct the Fallen Judges, and restore logic. All Judges have to respect US Army Officer Alejandro Evaristo Perez (the Pro Se Party who owns the copyrights) like other Honorable Federal Judges respected the "Motion Picture Association Of America Inc." as the copyright holder in his own jurisdiction. Will the US Supreme Court finally end the trade conspiracy by the Disney Villains and Pirates Judges

of the Caribbean? Will the Disney Pirates surrender or walk the plank to fall into the deep sea of criminality?

———†———

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On 08 May 2024, the Pro Se Petitioner informing the 5th Circuit Court (App. 14a) that the Pro Se Party is filing a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari like the Pro Se Party did for "Alejandro Evaristo Perez v. The Walt Disney Company" (Sup. Ct. No. 23-340 (2023)), because the Pro Se Party disagrees with the corrupted irrelevant decision written by Fallen Judge Patrick Errol Higginbotham Jr., Fallen Judge Carl E. Stewart, and Fallen Judge Leslie Southwick that is full of disputed irrelevant case law as a ruse to avoid talking about real agreed-on case law. This formal letter (App. 14a) with a peaceful settlement offer was in lieu of a petition of en bank and for panel rehearsing and within the MEMORANDUM TO COUNSEL OR PARTIES LISTED BELOW's Pro Se Cases guidelines provided (App. 14a) due

to many of the illegal ruses previously mentioned. The Pro Se Petitioner is allowed to file a "PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI" IAW the Judgement Order within a 90 day period as mentioned earlier. The Disney Villains and Fallen Judges choose to follow ignore the letter and settlement, so the Pro Se Petitioner is now filing another "PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI" against the cheap pathetic Disney Pirates of Caribbean, whose best efforts is a fraudulent Motion to Dismiss (TXSD Docket #93) addressed to our Honorable Judge Charles Eskridge, who is recused. Before the US Supreme Court, the choices are as follows:

CHOICE 1: (GRANT) "Parley!" - The first option in the initial question is "Whether the US Supreme Court wants to mediate a settlement of $29,744,550,000, apologies, and copyrights purchases?". The US Supreme Court already determined the criminality of the Disney Villains in "Alejandro Evaristo Perez v. The Walt Disney Company"

(Sup. Ct. No. 23-340 (2023)), when the Disney Villains defaulted by failing their own November 1, 2023 deadline; thus, all case law from that case is all already agreed-on by all parties, and affirmed by the US Supreme Court, which is relisted above in the TABLE OF AUTHORITIES. However, the Disney Villains are officially criminals in a double jeopardy case and behaving worst the "Pirates of the Caribbean". Therefore, we may as well have fun with the Disney Pirates and invoke "Pirate Code" regrading "Parley". Experts mentioned that the term written as "Parley" (often stylized as "parlay") on the "Pirata Codex" (also known as "Pirate Articles"; also closely related to "Articles of Privateers") used by Pirates like Pirate Henry Morgan and Pirate Bartholomew Roberts, who allowed any person to invoke temporary protection and brought before the captain (the leaders of each disputing party) to "negotiate" without being attacked until the parley is complete. In similar fashion, the US Supreme Court is welcome to mediate the

humor-based parley between the Honorable US War Hero Alejandro Evaristo Perez (The Pro Se Petitioner) and the Disney Pirates of the Caribbean (The Responders) over the $29,744,550,000 of damages to be paid for the crimes agreed-on in SCOTUS case 23-340; and whether Alejandro Evaristo Perez (The Pro Se Petitioner)'s copyrights should be sold to the Disney Pirates, or kept by Alejandro Evaristo Perez (The Pro Se Petitioner), who actually wrote copyrighted novels. Ironically, piracy has a long tradition in the 5th Circuit's City of New Orleans, Louisiana, such as the famous French pirate Jean Lafitte and privateer who operated in the Gulf of Mexico in the early 19th century. On a humorous note, Fallen Judge Higginbotham, Fallen Judge Stewart, and Fallen Judge Southwick are following their New Orleans's Piracy Historical Tradition, so the parties may as well "parley" if the US Supreme Court wishes to humor the parties by grant such a request to such dirty Disney Pirates of the Caribbean, who are trying to steal copyright treasures

of the Honorable Military Officer Alejandro Evaristo Perez (the Pro Se Petitioner), which are TX 8-652-720 (The Real Lord Vader - The Destroyer of Star Wars), TX 8-986-945 (The Real Lord Vaders – The Destroyers of Star Wars), and TX 8-718-247 (Empire of God). Pro Se Party open to IRS guidance.

CHOICE 2: (DENY) **"The Disney Pirates immediately pay the $29,744,550,000 or the Pirates walk the plank!"** - The second option in the initial question is "the Court orders the Disney Villains to pay the $29,744,550,000, retire Fallen Judges, and let the Hero Alejandro Evaristo Perez keep his own copyrights in order save time, avoid paper, and reduce drama in this Double Jeopardy case?" This decision by the Court is the best choice for quick justice to the Pro Se Petitioner, clean the Judicial System from the chaos create by the Disney Pirates, and reinforce the need to follow the US Supreme Court case law like "Alejandro Evaristo Perez v. The Walt Disney Company" (Sup. Ct. No. 23-340 (2023)), the 9th Circuit case law of "Rossi V. Motion Picture

Association Of America Inc., 391 F.3d 1000, 1007 (9th Cir. 2004)", and the agreed-on other case law listed in TABLE OF AUTHORITIES. The US Supreme Court grants the Pro Se Petitioner the right to invoice the Responders (the Parent Corporation of "The Walt Disney Company" for simplicity) for $29,744,550,000 settlement like the Pro Se Petitioner invoice Microsoft (Parent Corporation) for $256,000,000,000 in the agreed-on case of "Alejandro Evaristo Perez v. LinkedIn Corporation", Sup. Ct. No. 22-726 (2023) via its associated 9th Circuit Court of Appeals Case #21-15234, Docket #37. With the blessing of the US Supreme Court, the SEC and IRS force the Disney Pirates (Responders) to pay $29,744,550,000 settlement to Alejandro Evaristo Perez (the copyright holder) or the Disney Pirates face jail time for their crimes in this case and in "Alejandro Evaristo Perez v. The Walt Disney Company" (Sup. Ct. No. 23-340 (2023)) as allowed by double jeopardy case law such as "Benton v. Maryland", Sup. Ct., 395 U.S. 784, No. 201 (1969); "USA v.

One Assortment of 89 Firearms", Sup. Ct., 465 U.S. 354, No. 82-1047 (1984); "USA v. Ursery", Sup. Ct., 518 U.S. 267, No. 95-345 (1996).

———†———

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

The US Supreme Court may still want to avoid the jailing of 4 Fallen Judges for their corruption and (x) number of unpatriotic Corporatistas for violating 17 U.S.C. Chapter 5 "Copyright Infringements", violating 15 U.S.C. Chapter 1 § 1 "Conspiracy", violating 18 U.S.C. § 1341 "Frauds and Swindles", violating 18 U.S.C. § 1621 "Perjury", and violating the only agreed-on caselaw of "Rossi V. Motion Picture Association Of America Inc., 9th Circuit, No. 03-16034 (2004)." IF THE SUPREME COURT DENIES THIS RIGHTEOUS PETITION, THE PRO SE PETITIONER CAN ASSUME THAT THE UNETHICAL RESPONDERS AND THE FALLEN JUDGE' WRONGFUL ACTIONS ARE VIOLATING 17 U.S.C. CHAPTER 5 "COPYRIGHT

INFRINGEMENTS", VIOLATING 15 U.S.C. CHAPTER 1 § 1 "CONSPIRACY", VIOLATING 18 U.S.C. § 1341 "FRAUDS AND SWINDLES", VIOLATING 18 U.S.C. § 1621 "PERJURY", AND VIOLATING THE ONLY AGREED-ON CASELAW OF "ROSSI V. MOTION PICTURE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA INC., 9TH CIRCUIT, NO. 03-16034 (2004), THAT THE SUPREME COURT DOES NOT WANT TO WASTE THEIR TIME ON FELONS, AND THAT THE PRO SE HAS EVERY RIGHT TO HAND THE FELONS TO THEIR RESPECTIVE DISTRICT ATTORNEYS TO BEGIN CRIMINAL PROSECUTION FOR SUCH VIOLATIONS, AND THE UNETHICAL RESPONDERS MUST PAY THE PETITIONER A TOTAL OF THE $29,744,550,000. The Pro Se Petitioner has provide the Microsoft Excel spreadsheets with the mathematical formals, scenarios (ex. $31BN+), and facts to the unethical Responders. Mass emails have been sent for mass accountability and to inform stakeholders

†

CONCLUSION

The Supreme Court has to choose between Choice 1 "Parley with the Disney Pirates of the Caribbean" or Choice 2 "Make the Disney Pirates pay the Honorable Alejandro Evaristo Perez or the Disney Pirates walk the plank!" The unethical Disney Villains Responders failed to purchase the copyrights and continues to falsely claim ownership of the Pro Se Petitioner's copyrights. In accordance with "USA V. AUTOMATED MEDICAL LABORATORIES" 770 F.2d 399 [1985] and "USA V. CINCOTTA", 689 F.2d 238, 241-42 [1982], the list of conspirators with double jeopardy criminal liability as follows: The Responders (Parent Corporation who and subsidiaries), Bob Iger, (The Walt Disney Company's CEO), Bob Chapek (The Walt Disney Company's former CEO), Christopher Michael Boeck (TXSD), Elizabeth Kristin Duffy (TXSD), Harriet Ellan Miers (TXSD), Thomas A Connop (TXSD), Gregory L Doll (CACD), Conspirator

Jamie Kendall (CACD), Scott Jones (TXSD), Andrew Tucker Davison (TXSD), Fallen Judge Keith P. Ellison (TXSD), Fallen Judge Patrick Errol Higginbotham Jr. (5th Cir.), Fallen Judge Carl E. Stewart (5th Cir.), and Fallen Judge Leslie Southwick (5th Cir.). The Pro Se Petitioner provides "Safe Passage" if taken and upon peacefully settling. $29,744,550,000 US Federal Case back to seas of agreed-on case law like "Perez vs Disney" (Case No. 23-340 and No. 23M2.) and "Rossi V. Motion Picture Association Of America Inc." 9th Circuit, No. 03-16034 (2004)? Or the US Supreme Court make the Disney Pirates walk the plank for stealing the copyright treasures of the Honorable US War Hero and US Army Officer Alejandro Evaristo Perez?

———†———

APPENDIX & ADMIN REQUIREMENTS

Any Appendixes and additional documents are the different decisions and administrative items are in uploaded in the Fifth Circuits' PACER-CM/ECF System and other cases associated in the CACD and TXSD. The Pro Se

Petitioner requires the US Supreme Court to obey our US Codes, our US Supreme Court Rules, caselaws, and in the Table of Authorities. All Pro Se Party's petitions, pleadings, requests, and motions should entertained by all Federal Judges, which is the Pro Se Party's Constitutional and Statutory Right. These "Pro Se Friendly" case law (*Haines v. Kerner;* Resnick v. Hayes; *McKinney v. De Bord; Faretta v. California)* and waivers includes all paperwork, administrative requirements, docketing, and processing. These case law includes applies to US Supreme Court Rule 29 "Filing and Service of Documents; Special Notifications; Corporate Listing"; Rule 33.2 "Document Preparation: Booklet Format; 8 1/2 – by 11 inch Paper Format", Rule 34 "Document Preparation: General Requirements", and the use of Rule 40 "Veterans, Seamen, and Military Cases" to comply for Rule 38 "Fees" and Rule 43 "Costs". The petition meets the limits of the "under 40 opaque, unglazed white pages" under 9,000 words IAW Rule 33. The Pro Se

Petitioner is following complying "State Of Oklahoma v Shriver" booklet sample and the approved "Perez v. LinkedIn" No. 22-726 booklets from 2023.

As required by US Supreme Court Rule 33.2, the original of any such document shall be signed by the party proceeding Pro Se or under any other applicable federal statute (ex. Title 5 U.S. Code 3331 "Military Officer Oath").

God bless America, NATO, and its Allies,

By: _____ AEP 31 MAY 2024

Alejandro Evaristo Perez Date

PRO SE PETITIONER, US HONORABLE VETERAN, US ARMY OFFICER, AUTHOR, COPYRIGHT HOLDER IN HIS OWN JURISDICTION, INNOVATOR, AND MAN AFTER GOD'S HEART.

BLANK PAGE

APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINION BY APPEAL JUDGES WHO BROKE LEGAL PRECEDENCE WHEN FAILING TO ENFORCE THE AGREED-ON CASE OF "ROSSI V. MOTION PICTURE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA INC." AND US SUPREME COURT CASE 23-340 (APRIL 25, 2024, DOCKET # 41-1)

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

ALEJANDRO EVARISTO PEREZ

Pro Se Plaintiff - Pro Se Appellant

v.

DISNEY CORPORATION; WALT DISNEY COMPANY; DISNEY ENTERPRISES, INCORPORATED; DISNEY ABC INCORPORATED; DISNEY STORE USA, L.L.C.; DISNEY/ABC INTERNATIONAL TELEVISION,

INCORPORATED, DOING BUSINESS AS DISNEY - ABC INTERNATIONAL TELEVISION; BUENA VISTA TELEVISION, L.L.C., DOING BUSINESS AS DISNEY - ABC DOMESTIC TELEVISION; MAGICAL CRUISE COMPANY, LIMITED, DOING BUSINESS AS DISNEY CRUISE LINES (DCL); BUENA VISTA THEATRICAL GROUP, LIMITED, DOING BUSINESS AS DISNEY THEATRICAL GROUP,

Defendants - Appellees

Case No. 23-20432

Before: Judge Patrick Errol Higginbotham Jr., Judge Carl E. Stewart, Judge Leslie Southwick.

Alejandro Evaristo Perez filed a pro se civil fourth amended complaint against numerous defendants, referred to collectively as Disney. The complaint alleged that Disney violated the copyright laws, intentionally inflicted emotional distress (IIED), and engaged in restraint of trade. Disney filed a motion to dismiss the fourth amended complaint under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 12(b)(2) and (6), among other things. Disney also filed a motion to stay all responsive deadlines and additional substantive motions pending resolution of the motion to dismiss. The district court granted the stay. Following a hearing, the district court granted Disney's motion to dismiss. The district court found that, except for Disney ABC Incorporated (Disney ABC), Perez had again failed to allege any contacts between the defendants listed in the fourth amended complaint and the State Texas and dismissed the complaint against them without prejudice for lack of personal jurisdiction. With respect to Disney ABC, the

district court found that Perez had failed to allege claims on which relief can be granted for copyright infringement under 17 U.S.C. § 106A, for IIED, and for conspiracy to restrain trade under 15 U.S.C. § 1. The district court dismissed these claims against Disney ABC with prejudice. A district court's dismissal for lack of personal jurisdiction is reviewed de novo. Panda Brandywine Corp. v. Potomac Elec. Power Co., 253 F.3d 865, 867 (5th Cir. 2001). "The burden of establishing personal jurisdiction over a non-resident defendant lies with the plaintiff." In re Chinese-Manufactured Drywall Prods. Liab. Litig., 753 F.3d 521, 529 (5th Cir. 2014) (internal quotation marks, citation, and emphasis omitted). The district court was not clearly erroneous in the factual finding that the relevant defendants had insufficient contacts with Texas and committed no error in dismissing this portion of Perez's complaint without prejudice for lack of personal jurisdiction. See Pervasive Software, Inc. v. Lexware GmbH

& Co. KG, 688 F.3d 214, 219-20 (5th Cir. 2012). A party may move to dismiss a complaint for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6). A plaintiff fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted when the claim does not contain "enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face." Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007). We review a district court's dismissal for failure to state a claim pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6) de novo. In re Katrina Canal Breaches Litig., 495 F.3d 191, 205 (5th Cir. 2007). The district court did not err in finding that none of the claims against Disney ABC were facially plausible. See Bell Atlantic Corp., 550 U.S. at 570. Perez has not shown that the district court acted in a biased and unjust way by staying proceedings pending the resolution of the motion to dismiss and denying his motion for summary judgment as moot. Judicial rulings alone almost never are a valid basis

for a claim of bias. Liteky v. United States, 510 U.S. 540, 555 (1994); Andrade v. Chojnacki, 338 F.3d 448, 455 (5th Cir. 2003). The judgment of the district court is

AFFIRMED.

OPINION BY THE FALLEN JUDGE KEITH ELLISON WHO TWICE FAILED TO PROTECT THE COPYRIGHT HOLDER IN THEIR OWN JURISDICTION, WHO USED A FRADULENT MOTION TO DISMISS ADDRESSED TO OUR HONORABLE JUDGE CHARLES ESKRIDGE, IGNORED CASE LAW, AND VIOLATED FRCP RULES (AUGUST 30, 2024. DOCKET #108)

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

ALEJANDRO EVARISTO PEREZ, Pro Se Plaintiff

v.

DISNEY CORPORATION, THE WALT DISNEY COMPANY, ET LA, Defendant

---

Case No. TXSD 4:21-cv-00765

ORDER ADOPTING MEMORANDUM

AND RECOMMENDATION

Pending before the Court is Defendant the Walt Disney Company's Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Fourth Amended Complaint. ECF No. 93. The Court GRANTS the Motion and DISMISSES all claims against the Walt Disney Company; Disney Enterprises, Inc.; Disney Stores USA, LLC; Disney/ABC International Television, Inc.; Buena Vista Television, LLC; Magical Cruise Company, Limited; and Buena Vista Theatrical Group LTD WITHOUT PREJUDICE. All claims against Disney ABC Inc. are DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE. BACKGROUND The Court previously found it lacked personal jurisdiction over the Walt Disney Company and dismissed Perez's case with prejudice. ECF No. 54. On appeal the Fifth Circuit affirmed in part and reversed in part, concluding that dismissal for lack of personal jurisdiction is not an adjudication on the merits and must be without prejudice. ECF Nos. 84, 85. The Court subsequently converted its prior dismissal to be without prejudice. ECF No. 86. Perez has subsequently

filed a Fourth Amended Complaint, which is nearly identical to his prior Complaints aside from the addition of several new Defendants. ECF No. 87. ANALYSIS Perez's Fourth Amended Complaint does not provide a basis for the Court to find it has personal jurisdiction over the Walt Disney Company; Disney Enterprises, Inc.; Disney Stores USA, LLC; Disney/ABC International Television, Inc.; Buena Vista Television, LLC; Magical Cruise Company, Limited; and Buena Vista Theatrical Group LTD. Perez indicates that all of these entities are incorporated and have a principal place of business outside of Texas. ECF No. 87 at 4-6. Additionally, Perez's Fourth Amended Complaint asserts no contacts between these Defendants and the state of Texas that would permit the Court to exercise specific jurisdiction. As for the remaining Defendant, Perez's Complaint alleges that Disney ABC is incorporated in New York and has a principal place of business in Texas. ECF No. 87 at 5. Taking these assertions

as true, the Court has personal jurisdiction over this Defendant. However, Perez's Fourth Amended Complaint fails to state a claim against Disney ABC. Perez brings three claims against the Defendants alleging (1) copyright infringement under 17 U.S.C. § 106A, (2) intentional infliction of emotional distress, and (3) conspiracy to restrain trade under 15 U.S.C. § 1. ECF No. 87 at 7. As a threshold matter, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2) requires that a complaint contain facts alleging how each individual Defendant is liable. Anderson v. U.S. Dep't of Housing & Urban Dev., 554 F.3d 525, 528 (5th Cir. 2008). Perez's Complaint makes no allegations specific to Disney ABC and includes only conclusory allegations referencing the Defendants as a group. Additionally, Perez fails to state a claim on which relief can be granted under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6). First, Perez has not adequately alleged a violation of 17 U.S.C. §106A. This statute covers only "visual art," which is

explicitly defined by statute to exclude books. 17 U.S.C. § 101 ("A work of visual art does not include . . . book[s].").

Perez's claim for copyright infringement exclusively involves ownership over his book. As a result, he has failed to state a claim under this statute. Second, Perez has not pleaded facts sufficient to state a claim for intentional infliction of emotional distress. Intentional infliction of emotional distress requires: (1) the defendant acted intentionally or recklessly; (2) the conduct was extreme and outrageous; and (3) the conduct caused the plaintiff severe emotional distress. Twyman v. Twyman, 855 S.W.2d 619, 621 (Tex. 1993). The conduct must be "so outrageous in character, and so extreme in degree, as to go beyond all possible bounds of decency, and to be regarded as atrocious, and utterly intolerable in a civilized community." Brewerton v. Dalrymple, 997 S.W.2d 212, 216 (Tex. 1999). The Complaint makes only conclusory allegations with respect to these elements and does not plead facts sufficient

for the intentional infliction of emotional distress claim to proceed. Third, Perez claims that Defendants have committed a conspiracy to restrain trade in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1. Defining the relevant market is a threshold requirement for pleading a claim pursuant to this statute. Shah v. VHS San Antonio Partners, L.L.C., 985 F.3d 450, 454 (5th Cir. 2021); Apani Sw., Inc. v. Coca–Cola Enters., Inc., 300 F.3d 620, 627 (5th Cir. 2002). Failure to do so makes a claim under this statute legally insufficient. New Orleans Ass'n of Cemetery Tour Guides & Co. v. New Orleans Archdiocesan Cemeteries, 56 F.4th 1026, 1039 (5th Cir. 2023). Perez's complaint has not attempted to define the relevant market under this provision. Accordingly, Perez's claims against Disney ABC must also be dismissed.

CONCLUSION For the foregoing reasons, the Court GRANTS the Walt Disney Company's Motion to Dismiss. ECF No. 93. All of Perez's claims against the Walt Disney Company; Disney Enterprises, Inc.; Disney Stores USA,

LLC; Disney/ABC International Television, Inc.; Buena Vista Television, LLC; Magical Cruise Company, Limited; and Buena Vista Theatrical Group LTD are DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE. All of Perez's claims against Disney ABC Inc. are DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE. All other motions pending before the Court including Perez's Motion to Strike, ECF No. 105, Motion for Summary Judgment, ECF No. 97, and Motion for Default Judgment, ECF No. 106, are DENIED AS MOOT. IT IS SO ORDERED. Signed at Houston, Texas on August 30, 2023. Keith P. Ellison United States District Judge

EXCERPT OF THE 5TH CIRCUIT'S PRO SE GUIDELINES AND EXCERPTS OF LETTER SUBMITTED BY PRO SE PATY AS LOGICAL SUBSTITUTE TO PETITION FOR PANEL REHEARING AND REHEARING EN BANC BY FALLEN JUDGES (APRIL 25, 2024 - DOCKET # 41-2)

The "MEMORANDUM TO COUNSEL OR PARTIES LISTED BELOW" states that "*Pro Se Cases. If you were unsuccessful in the district court and/or on appeal, and are considering filing a petition for certiorari in the United States Supreme Court, you do not need to file a motion for stay of mandate under Fed. R. App. P. 41. The issuance of the mandate does not affect the time, or your right, to file with the Supreme Court.*"

"The Pro Se Party is informing the 5th Circuit Court that the Pro Se Party is filing a Petition for a Writ of

Certiorari like the Pro Se Party did for "Alejandro Evaristo Perez v. The Walt Disney Company" (Sup. Ct. No. 23-340 (2023)), because the Pro Se Party disagrees with the corrupted irrelevant decision of Fallen Judge Higginbotham, Fallen Judge Stewart, and Fallen Judge Southwick that is full of disputed irrelevant case law as a ruse to avoid talking about real agreed-on case law."

"The Pro Se Party disagrees with the Fallen Judge Higginbotham, Fallen Judge Stewart, and Fallen Judge Southwick, because punishing the copyright holder in his own jurisdiction by forcing the copyright holder pay criminals violates US Supreme Court case law, 9th Circuit Court case law, principles like "legal precedence", and basic logic (Why would the copyright holder pay the infringers? Why would the car owner pay the car thief who stole his car? Why would a homeowner pay an arsonist who burned his house? Unless, the logic is broken.)."