

No.

**IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES**

CLIMATE UNITED FUND, ET AL.

Plaintiffs (Appellees)

V.

CITIBANK, N.A., ET AL.

Defendants (Appellants)

TAREK FARAG, pro se,

Proposed Intervenor (Appellant)

**ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO
THE COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT
OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT**

**PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
(ASKING FOR THE IMMEDIATE ATTENTION OF
THE COURT DUE TO ITS URGENCY)**

**TAREK FARAG
PETITIONER, PRO SE
411 N WARWICK AVE,
WESTMONT, IL 60559
(630) 709 3965
tarekfarag@comcast.net**

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

This petition seeks the urgent intervention of this Court to address the worst **Hoax** in history and put an end to all its litigations, which is the claims that “burning fossil fuels and generating CO2 is causing harmful global warming” (not arguing if there is global warming or not). Petitioner believes that the lower Courts were afraid to declare the reality of the Hoax. Such declaration could result in the prosecution of numerous public officials and entities, allegedly misappropriating hundreds of billions of dollars in public resources to support the Hoax. The fraud and corruption reached unprecedented levels, with people using the courts to grab the fraudulent funds (as if making it legal), and some Attorneys General potentially complicit in the Hoax. In many instances, courts were claimed to have facilitated the Hoax, disregarding scientific evidence that challenges its validity, even the simple evidence that a six-year-old can understand. The petitioner, having recognized this fraud, has initiated legal actions against various officials and entities and sought to intervene in related cases. He challenged, and is challenging the Hoax, without anyone daring to oppose his facts, instead, they wrongfully attacked his standing and procedures.

Questions Presented:

- I. Did the District Court and Appellate Court err in denying petitioner’s motion to intervene?
- II. Did the District Court and Appellate Court err in failing to address petitioner’s opposition to the Hoax?
- III. Should a citizen have the right to prosecute law enforcement or public officials for alleged corruption?
- IV. Courts should reduce the amount of paperwork.

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING

Petitioner: (Proposed Intervenor Defendant) TAREK FARAG (hereinafter **Farag**), pro se.

Plaintiffs-Respondents: CLIMATE UNITED FUND, POWER FORWARD COMMUNITIES, INC., COALITION FOR GREEN CAPITAL, AAG ILLINOIS FINANCE AUTHORITY, EFFICIENCY MAINE TRUST, MINNESOTA CLIMATE INNOVATION FINANCE AUTHORITY, CALIFORNIA INFRASTRUCTURE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT BANK, and JUSTICE CLIMATE FUND.

Defendants: CITIBANK, N.A., UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, and LEE ZELDIN (in his official capacity as EPA's Administrator).

ABBREVIATIONS USED:

HJ: Honorable Judge.

Hoax: The claims that Burning Fossil Fuel and generating CO2 (carbon dioxide) is Causing harmful Global Warming.

[D16]: Docket 16.

[29a]: Page 29 of the appendix.

SCOTUS: Supreme Court Of The United States.

ApDCC: Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

DstDC: United States District Court for The District of Columbia

LIST OF PROCEEDINGS IN COURTS

DstDC, Complaint For Declaratory And Injunctive Relief, California Infrastructure and Economic Development Bank, et al., v., Citibank, N.A., et al., 1:25-cv-820 [D1][65a], filed on 3/19/25, consolidated with other cases to case 1:25-cv-698, on 3/25/25. Farag filed his motion to intervene [D72] [56a] on 3/31/25, but was wrongly entered on 4/11/25 missing its even pages. Plaintiff State Green Bank with other plaintiffs filed a memorandum in opposition to Farag's motion to Intervene [D74][42a] on 4/14/25. HJ Chutkan denied Farag's motion to intervene [41a] on 4/15/25. On 4/16/25 the Clerk filed the correct motion to intervene of Farag [D85][23a]. On 4/15/25 Order Granting preliminary injunction [D80][20a]. On 4/16/25 EPA and Citibank filed their notices of appeal [D81] [D86], 25-5122, On 4/17/25, Farag filed his Notice of Appeal to join the EPA [D93][16a], and ApDCC consolidated appeal 25-5122 with 25-5123. On 4/18/25, HJ Chutkan denied the correct motion to intervene of Farag, and obstructed his notice of appeal and his further submissions [18a]. Around 5/7/25, Farag filed an extraordinary writ of certiorari asking SCOTUS to review the denial of his intervention, but the Clerk returned it on 5/13/25 [77a]. On 5/27/25 Farag filed his motion to intervene in appeal # 25-5122 in ApDCC [2a]. On 6/9/25 his intervention was denied [1a].

RELATED CASES

Petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, Titled Farag v. Biden, et al., Docket # 24-1197.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner Tarek Farag asks this Court for a writ of certiorari to review the judgments of the U.S. District Court, District of Columbia, and the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

OPINIONS BELOW

On 4/16/25, DstDC Ordered a Preliminary Injunction [D80][20a]. On 4/17/25 Farag filed his notice of appeal [19a]. On 4/18/25, HJ Chutkan (DstDC) denied the correct motion of Farag's intervention, denied his notice of appeal, and blocked his further submissions [18a]. On 5/6/25 Farag filed a Petition for an Extraordinary Writ of Certiorari that was returned from SCOTUS 5/13/25 [77a]. On 5/21/25 Farag filed a motion to intervene as an appellant in ApDCC in appeal # 25-5122 [2a]. On 6/9/25 ApDCC denied his motion to intervene [1a].

JURISDICTION

On 4/15/25, HJ Chutkan (DstDC) denied Farag's motion to intervene as a defendant [41a]. He filed his Notice of Appeal on 4/17/25 [19a]. On 4/18/25, she denied his corrected motion to intervene, obstructed his notice of appeal, and further submissions [18a]. On 5/6/25 Farag filed a Petition for an Extraordinary Writ of Certiorari that was returned instead of docketing it pursuant to 28 USC §2101(b)[77a]. On 5/21/25 Farag filed a motion to intervene as an appellant in ApDCC appeal # 25-5122 [2a]. On 6/9/25 ApDCC denied his motion to intervene [1a]. This Court has jurisdiction under Rule 11, 28 USC §2101(e), §1651(a), and §1254(1).

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

In Case No. 1:25-cv-820, consolidated with Case No. 1:25-cv-698 on 4/25/25, Plaintiffs sought declaratory and

injunctive relief to compel the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to release billions of dollars allocated for “low- and zero-emission products, technologies, and services” [66a]. The EPA contended that their allocation was criminal and fraudulent [69a]. Farag, asserting evidence supporting the EPA’s position, and challenging the Hoax, filed a motion to intervene on 4/31/25, to stop the disbursement of these funds [56a, 23a]. The motion was served by first-class mail to the Court but was docketed on 4/11/25, with missing even-numbered pages. On 4/14/25, Plaintiffs opposed Farag’s intervention [42a] without serving him [55a]. They wrongly attacked his standing but **never disputed any of his arguments against the Hoax**. On 4/15/25, HJ Chutkan, denied Farag’s initial defective motion without addressing the filing error [41a]. The Clerk re-filed the corrected motion to intervene [23a] on 4/15/25, as a corrected to remedy the missing pages. On 4/17/25, Farag filed a Notice of Appeal [19a]. On 4/18/25, HJ Chutkan denied the corrected motion, mischaracterizing it as an “*Amended Motion to Intervene*,” and obstructed the Notice of Appeal by labeling it a “*Request for Leave to File Review*.” She further ordered, “*The Clerk shall accept no further submissions for filing in this case from Tarek Farag without further action or court order*” [18a]. On 5/6/25 Farag filed his Petition for an Extraordinary Writ of Certiorari using almost the same argument here, the Clerk of SCOUTS returned it without docketing on 5/13/25 [77a]. On 5/21/25 Farag filed, in ApDCC, almost the same exact motion to intervene he filed in DstDC [2a] attacking the Hoax. On 6/9/25 ApDCC denied Farag’s intervention without explanations [1a].

ARGUMENT

INTRODUCTION

Farag was perplexed by the dismissal of the evidence he presented, even the most simplified, to demonstrate that the Hoax is indeed a hoax. It seems that people were either unable or unwilling to acknowledge or challenge the evidence. Farag respectfully leaves it to this Honorable Court to find out.

I. The District Court And Appellate Court Erred in Denying Farag's Motions to Intervene

1- HJ Chutkan's denial of Farag's intervention on 4/15/25, failed to acknowledge its missing pages or its substance, suggesting a lack of review. Farag's corrected motion of 4/15/25, was not an amendment but a rectification of the filing error [23a]. Her subsequent denial on 4/18/25, ignored Farag's concrete interest, as he is incurring costs enforcing "zero emission-", "carbon free energy -.", "renewable portfolio-", and "environmental cost recovery" as Farag's receipt shows [27a], which are tied to "low- and zero-emission products, technologies, and services" as the plaintiffs stated [66a], which constitutes an injury-in-fact sufficient for intervention as of right. EPA's claims that the funds' allocation involved "criminal" misconduct further supports Farag's right to intervene to protect public interests. HJ Chutkan's failure to consider these factors and its denial without substantive reasoning constitute reversible error. See *R & G Mortg. Corp. v. Fed. Home Loan Mortg. Corp.*, 584 F.3d 1, 7 (1st Cir. 2009) (denial of intervention as of right is **appealable**).

2- Farag believes that the denial of his permissive intervention by HJ Chutkan should be appealed for abuse of discretion. Her denial was as though she hadn't read it, or its undisputed facts that a six-year old can understand,

which should have prompted her to grant the Motion. Instead, she obstructed Farag's notice of appeal and filing.

3- Appellate Court's denial of Farag's intervention without explanation [1a] put it in a worse position than the District Court's, and apply almost the same argument to it.

II. The Appellate Court and the District Court Erred In Not Addressing The Evidence Proving That CO2 Is Not Causing Harmful Global Warming

4- Farag's motion included simple undisputed arguments challenging the scientific basis of the Hoax [23]. ApDCC and DstDC failed to engage with these arguments, despite their relevance to the case. They had a duty to evaluate these claims, given their impact on public funds and policy, particularly in light of the EPA's allegations of fraud.

III. Should A Citizen Have The Right To Prosecute Law Enforcement Or Public Officials For Alleged Corruption?

5- Farag argues that when law enforcement or public officials are complicit in alleged crimes, citizens should have the right to pursue their prosecution. In this case, despite notifications to the FBI and Department of Justice, and Farag's official letters and complaints, no action was taken against the alleged fraud. The involvement of state officials and the scale of the alleged fraud necessitate a mechanism for citizen's intervention to uphold justice, particularly when public institutions fail to act, noting that there are laws to enable private person to arrest felons and offenders [e.g. Columbia § 23-582, 725 ILCS 5/107-3].

IV. The Courts Should Reduce The Amount Of Paperwork

6- Mandating the petitioners to change the format of the documents to the booklet one and to submit 40 copies require excessive time and resources that could be saved using the already mandated electronic filing.

ADDITIONAL REASONS TO GRANT THE WRIT

7- This petition raises issues of national and global significance, including the allocation of public funds, the integrity of scientific claims in policymaking, and the judiciary's role in preventing fraud. Ongoing disputes involving energy industries and state policies underscore the need for judicial clarity. Moreover, the legal system's accessibility to pro se litigants and its commitment to justice over procedural rigidity are at stake. Granting this writ will reaffirm the judiciary's duty to serve the public and ensure equitable access to justice.

CONCLUSION

This Court should grant the petition for a writ of certiorari, and other relief as appropriate.

Respectfully submitted July 7, 2025,



Petitioner: TAREK FARAG, pro se
411 N WARWICK AVE, WESTMONT, IL 60559
(630) 709 3965
tarekfarag@comcast.net