

25-5289

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

King Michael Oliver - Petitioner

vs.

United States - Respondent

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED
STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

King Michael Oliver

% Reg. # 30202-044

U.S.P. - Lee

P.O. Box 305

Jonesville, VA 24263

FILED

JUN 13 2025

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

ORIGINAL

King Michael Oliver

6-13-25

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Is the immunity of foreign sovereigns in the courts of the United States a Common Law doctrine that has been recognized by the Supreme Court of the United States for centuries?

2. Like sovereign immunity, is Head-of-state immunity based upon the notion of comity between independent states?

3. If the answers to the first two questions are yes, how could the District Court or the Appellate insist that my assertion of immunity and recognition be frivolous?

4. Are there any reasons why the Black Hebrew Nation-State should not be recognized?

5. Is the United States finally ready to end its war against me and the Black Hebrew Nation-State?

LIST OF PARTIES

All Parties appear in the caption on the cover page.

RELATED CASES

United States v. Michael Oliver, No. 3:24-cr-30108-DWD,
U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Illinois,
Order (doc. # 97) Denying Motion for Declaratory Judgement
(doc. # 96), entered on January 14, 2025

United States v. Michael Oliver, No. 25-1138, U.S. Court of
Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. Judgment entered on March 28,
2025.

RECEIVED

(NOTE - I HAVE NOT [REDACTED] THE DISMISSAL)

United States v. Michael Oliver, No. 25-1537, U.S. Court of
Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. Disposition Pending

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW ————— 8

JURISDICTION ————— 8

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS
INVOLVED ————— 9

STATEMENT OF THE CASE ————— 10-13

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT ————— 14-16

CONCLUSION ————— 16

PROOF OF SERVICE ————— 17

INDEX OF APPENDICES

A. United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois — Order denying Motion for Declaratory Judgment.
2 Pages

B. Petitioner's Motion for Declaratory Judgment — 10 pages

C. Petitioner's Documented Petition for Federal Acknowledgment
10 Pages

D. Petitioner's Appellate Brief ————— 26 Pages

E. Petitioner's Appellate Reply Brief ————— 12 Pages

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

Dred Scott v. Sandford, 60 U.S. 393	10
Estates of Ungar ex rel. Strachman v. Palestinian Auth., 315 F. Supp. 2d 164, 186 (April 23, 2004)	12
Banco Nacional de Cuba v. Sabbatino, 376 U.S. 398, 409	12
United States v. New York Trust Co., 75 F. Supp. 583, 587 (2nd Cir. 1946)	12
Wulfsohn v. Russian Republic, 237 N.Y. 372, 138 N.E. 24	12
Carl Marks & Co. v. Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, 665 F. Supp. 323 (2nd Cir. 1987)	12
United States v. Marcos, 1990 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 2678 (2nd Cir. 1990)	12
Lafontant v. Aristide, 844 F. Supp. 128 (2nd Cir. 1994)	12
In Re Alien Children Education Litigation, 501 F. Supp. 544, 545	15
The Paquete Habana, 175 U.S. 677, 682	15
Hampton v. Hanrahan, 600 F.2d 600, 609 (7th Cir. 1979)	15

STATUTES AND RULES

28 U.S.C. 1254 (1)	8
18 U.S.C. 922 (g)	10, 16
Rule 10	11
Rule 11	11
28 U.S.C. 1604	11
25 CFR Part 83	11

OPINIONS BELOW

I have not received the opinion/dismissal from the Appellate Court but the opinion/order of the District Court appears at Appendix A to the Petition and I am unsure of the reporting status of either.

JURISDICTION

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals dismissed my case was March 28, 2025 but I have not received the order to date (June 13, 2025) but was informed by a denial of my Motion to Consolidate Appeals (25-1138 and 25-1157), the order I received June 12, 2025 along with a Briefing schedule for the latest appeal.

My 90 days would be up on the 28th of this month so the Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. 1254 (1).

CONSTITUTIONAL/STATUTORY PROVISIONS

The Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act (28 U.S.C. 1602 et seq.) is the sole basis for obtaining jurisdiction over a foreign state. Any implicit and/or explicit waivers will also suffice.

COMITY via International Law of Nations and Federal Common Law.

United Nations Universal Declarations of Human Rights.

These provisions provide principles that have been incorporated with my pleadings that have been included in the Appendix (B-E). My pleadings should be read in their entirety.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This case was commenced by indictment via 18 U.S.C. 922 (g), a violation of the Constitution's 2nd Amendment right to bears arms not to be infringed... The denials of my Motion to Dismiss and the right to a fair trial shall bear witness that, as a slave, I have no rights that have been secured by the U.S. Constitution (Dred Scott v. Sandford, 60 U.S. 393). "All native people are not 'citizens' of the United States; the descendents of the aborigines, and those of African origin, are not entitled to the rights of citizens."

Ever since President's Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation, my people have been led from the outhouses and fields of crops to the prison cells of the Judicial System whereas slavery has only evolved.

Call it a Revolution?! I NO LONGER CONSENT

implicitly by Acquiescence and said consent was REVOKED by Motion For Declaratory Judgment (Appendix B). Without any implicit or explicit waivers, the District Court was without any jurisdiction to proceed and should have dismissed the case.

The Denials of my Motion for Declaratory Judgment and Petition for Federal Recognition (Appendix C) was appealed to the United States Court of Appeals for the 7th Circuit and fully Briefed (Appendix D and E) and the dismissal of the appeal is fresh news to me and I have not received a copy of the dismissal but the denial of my Motion to Consolidate both Appeals (received on 6-12-24) suggested that the Appeal (25-1138) had been indeed, dismissed.

12 of 19

~~After entering a personal record, let's go to the next page.~~
~~a task of justice assuming the world might~~

After sentencing, an Appeal immediately followed anticipating a denial of justice assuming the court might pass a ruling declaring the Appeal untimely. I am not sure why the appeal was dismissed.

At this point, arguing anything as a "citizen" or rights under the U.S. Constitution would be totally FRIVOLOUS so ~~I~~ I am asking the Supreme Court to review my case pursuant to Rules 10 (concerning 25-1138) and Rule 11 (concerning 25-1537).

As the King and Head-of-state, "a foreign state shall be immune from the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States and of the states except as provided in sections 1605 to 1607 of this chapter." (28 U.S.C. § 1604) This was my Declaration in my Motion for Declaratory Judgment (Appendix B 2). How could this be frivolous?

I also sought **FEDERAL RECOGNITION**, which can only be established by:

- (1) Act of Congress,
- (2) The decision of a U.S. Court, or
- (3) Procedures similar to The Administrative Procedure under 25 CFR Part 83 (Appendix B 9). How could this be frivolous?

The Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act provides the sole basis for obtaining jurisdiction over a foreign state and the Black Hebrew Nation has the right (INHERENT) to organize for the common welfare of our people and may adopt an appropriate constitution and bylaws and any amendments thereto (Appendix B 9). The Black Hebrew Nation has the inherent and inalienable rights of self-government etc. (Appendix B 10)

"The effect the United States' courts give to the actions or privileges and immunities of an unrecognized state is determined by applying the doctrine of comity. Comity is a grace or expression of the friendly relationship between sovereign states." (Estates of Ungar ex rel. Strachman v. Palestinian Auth., 315 F. Supp. 2d 164, 186 (April 23, 2004); quoting Banco Nacional de Cuba v. Sabbatino, 376 U.S. 398, 409).

"Sovereign Immunity is based on International Law and it may be asserted even by an unrecognized government" (United States v. New York Trust Co., 75 F. Supp. 583, 587 (2d Cir. 1946); quoting: Wulfsohn v. Russian Republic, 237 N.Y. 372, 138 N.E. 24). See Restatement (Second) of Foreign Relations Law of the United States § 107, commented ("A claim of immunity as a foreign state may not be defeated by asserting that an entity that qualifies for recognition as a state... is not recognized as such.") (Carl Marks & Co. v. Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, 665 F. Supp. 323 (2d Cir. 1987))

"Head-of-state immunity is historically derived from the doctrine of foreign sovereign immunity." (United States v. Marcos, 1990 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 2678 (2d Cir. 1990)) The Defined Rights of Kings, 86 Colum. L. Rev. 169, 170-71 (1986).

"Like foreign sovereign immunity, head of state immunity is based upon the notion of comity between independent states."

"No statute has modified the long standing rule of international and common law." (Lafontant v. Aristide, 844 F. Supp. 128 (2d Cir. 1994)) "Like the doctrine of diplomatic

immunity, head-of-state immunity is required to safeguard mutual respect among nations... See, Restatement (Third) 1994 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 123 of Foreign Relations Law of the United States (1986) §§ 464, 455 (diplomatic immunity). Heads of state must be able to freely perform their duties at home and abroad without the threat of civil and criminal liability in a foreign legal system... See, Note, Resolving the Confusion over Head of State Immunity: The Defined Right of Kings, 86 Colum. L. Rev. 169 (1980)."

How could these principles be frivolous? The United States have paid every other nation respect except the Black Hebrew Nation.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

This is a case of first impression but the lower courts have ruled a fight for freedom, "frivolous." (Appendix A)

The erroneous denials of my pleadings conflicts with important principles of the Comity of Nations, an important question of International Law that has NOT BEEN, but should be settled by the Supreme Court of the United States because the erroneous denials constitute a departure from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings pursuant to the ~~Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act~~ Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act and the Comity of Nations.

The exercise of this Court's supervisory power has thus become necessary in the establishment of precedence and justice.

"Nothing can destroy a government more quickly than its failure to observe its own laws, or worse, its disregard of the charter of its own existence If the Government becomes a lawbreaker, it breeds contempt for law; it invites every man to become a law unto himself, it invites anarchy."

"International Law is a part of our law, and **MUST BE ASCERTAINED AND ADMINISTERED BY THE COURTS OF JUSTICE OF APPROPRIATE JURISDICTION**, as often as questions of right depending upon it are duly presented for their determination. For this purpose, where there is no treaty, and no controlling executive or legislative act or judicial decision, resort **MUST BE** had to the customs and usages of civilized nations; and, as evidence of these, to the works of jurists and commentators, who by years

of labor, research, and experience, have made themselves peculiarly well acquainted with the subjects of which they treat. Such works are resorted to by judicial tribunals, not for speculations of their authors concerning what the law ought to be, but for trustworthy evidence of what the law really is".

(In *Re Alien Children Education Litigation*, 501 F. Supp. 544, 595) See also, *The Paquete Habana*, 175 U.S. 677, 683.

The immunity of foreign Sovereigns in United States courts is a common law doctrine recognized by the U.S. Supreme Court nearly two centuries ago. It is clearly not a frivolous issue.

It has become IMPERATIVE for this Supreme Court to consider judicial discretion in its supervisory power in granting the Petition for Writ of Certiorari being presented here, for any denials or turning a blind eye will confirm a participation and condonation of the continuation with the **WAR** objectives and secret tactics of the United States against the Black Hebrew Nation, (e.g. "The FBI MEMORANDUM (Feb. 1968) described the goals of **COINTELPRO** as: (*Hampton v. Hanrahan*, 600 F.2d 600, 609 (7th Cir. 1979))

1. Prevent a coalition of militant black nationalist groups
2. Prevent the rise of a messiah who could unify and electrify the militant nationalist movement.... Martin Luther King, Stokely Carmichael, and Elijah Muhammed all aspire to this position.
3. Prevent violence on the part of black nationalist groups.

4. Prevent militant black nationalist groups and leaders from gaining respectability by discrediting them.

5. Prevent the long-range growth of militant black nationalist organizations, especially among youth. Senate Select Committee to study Government Operations with respect to Intelligence Activities, the FBI's Covert Action Program to Destroy the Black Panther Party, S. Rep. No. 94-755, 94th Cong., 2d Sess., 187 (1976). These goals were incorporated into the various directives which Marlin Johnson, the special agent-in-charge of the Chicago FBI office, received instructing him to establish the program in Chicago.") for there has clearly been a Declaration of War for which I, a completely neutral party, have been caught in the crossfire and have become a casualty of this war as a direct result via Gun Control Act (18 U.S.C. 922(g)).

I wish to have peace, not war. I wish to conduct peaceful negotiations of a Treaty in establishing a government-to-government relationship between me and the United States and the United Nations via Federal Recognition.

This Petition should be granted for these issues could never be frivolous.

CONCLUSION

I respectfully request the Supreme Court to grant my Petition for a Writ of Certiorari.

King Michael King
6-13-25

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

King Michael Oliver - PETITIONER

VS

United States - RESPONDENTS

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, King Michael Oliver, hereby declare that on June 17, 2025, this filing will be placed in the institution's U.S.P.S. system to be mailed to the court and a copy of this, as required by Rule 29, will be mailed to the following:

Solicitor General of the United States
Department of Justice, Room 5614
950 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, D.C. 20530-0001

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on June 16, 2025

King Michael Oliver