

No. _____

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Qasyca J. Amura — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

vs.

The State of California — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

The Supreme Court of California did not address the merits.
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Qasyca J. Amura, Thee 1st
(Your Name)

44750 60th Street West

(Address)

Lancaster, California

(City, State, Zip Code)

93536-7619

Proceeding In Propria Persona

Prison ID Number is D-88349

(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

Whether the framers of the U. S. Constitution intended for the disqualification for public office clause to be used as a safeguard against members of government who knowingly violate the law?

LIST OF PARTIES

- ☒ All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.
- ☐ All parties **do not** appear in the caption of the case on the cover page. A list of all parties to the proceeding in the court whose judgment is the subject of this petition is as follows:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	4
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	6
CONCLUSION.....	7

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A A court order , filed October 18 , 2017 , by
the Supreme Court of California.

APPENDIX B
A motion addressed to the Supreme Court of California , dated November 21 ,
2017 , seeking The Process Of Law Due.

APPENDIX C
The response from the Supreme Court of California , dated
December 4 , 2017.

APPENDIX D
There is no Appendix D.

APPENDIX E
There is no Appendix E.

APPENDIX F
There is no Appendix F.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

There is no case law used in this petition.

STATUTES AND RULES

There are no congressional statutes or rules cited in this petition.

OTHER

Does not apply.

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

OPINIONS BELOW

☐ For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

- ☐ reported at _____; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

- ☐ reported at _____; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

☒ For cases from **state courts**:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix A to the petition and is

- ☐ reported at _____; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☒ is unpublished.

The opinion of the _____ court appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

- ☐ reported at _____; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

JURISDICTION

☐ For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was _____.

☐ No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

☐ A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: _____, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____.

☐ An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. ____ A ____.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1254(1).



For cases from **state courts**:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was Oct. 18, 2017.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix A.

☐ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: _____, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____.

☐ An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. ____ A ____.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

" NO PERSON SHALL BE A SENATOR OR REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS, OR ELECTOR OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT, OR HOLD ANY OFFICE, CIVIL OR MILITARY, UNDER THE UNITED STATES, OR UNDER ANY STATE, WHO, HAVING PREVIOUSLY TAKEN AN OATH, AS A MEMBER OF CONGRESS, OR AS AN OFFICER OF THE UNITED STATES, OR AS A MEMBER OF ANY STATE LEGISLATURE, OR AS AN EXECUTIVE OR JUDICIAL OFFICER OF ANY STATE, TO SUPPORT THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES, SHALL HAVE ENGAGED IN INSURRECTION OR REBELLION AGAINST THE SAME, OR GIVEN AID OR COMFORT TO THE ENEMIES THEREOF. BUT CONGRESS MAY BY A TWO-THIRDS OF EACH HOUSE, REMOVE SUCH DISABILITY."

Amendment XIV, Section 3, to the United States Constitution.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Petitioner is a person whom, near 30 years ago, was imprisoned in the California state prison system. For legal reasons, this court must know that he, petitioner, is a black person. Still, the fact remains that petitioner was born under and committed to prison in the name of a former white slave owner. Time passed. Then, more than a decade after his imprisonment began, petitioner began trying to change his name.

It wasn't long before petitioner learned that an unconstitutional California law barred his way. According to the California law, no person under the legal jurisdiction of the California prison system can change his or her name unless the Chief Executive Officer of the California prison system first approves of the name change.

Again, the California law is unconstitutional! And it is for this reason that petitioner immediately applied to the California Supreme Court to invalidate the law. Unfortunately, the court openly refused to do it. Evidently, just the irrefutable fact that the judicial officers at the Supreme Court

of California have decided that they don't want to
obey the law is a good enough legal reason
for them not to do it. SEE APPENDIX B.

//

//

//

//

//

//

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Law is something that is needed to guard the people. There can be no mistake about that. And government was put in place to guarantee that the people will always be protected from lawlessness. But what happens when it is the members of government who boldly act without law?

Obviously, the answer can be found in the disqualification for public office clause. Exactly like the framers intended for it to happen, that legal clause will put a stop to all forms of government lawlessness. SEE U.S. CONST., AMDT. XIV, SEC. 3.

Many people all over the planet have things that they've decided they'd rather not do. Some do those things anyway while others still do not do them. In those specific situations, more likely than not, "CHOICE" plays a major roll in the decisions to do and or not to do them. This situation, however, is different.

The members of the Supreme Court of California do not have a "CHOICE". Those judicial officers are each bound by their oath or affirmation to support both of the state and federal constitutions.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Danyca J. Amura, Thee 1st.

Date: January 7, 2018.

Appendix

A