

NO. _____

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

DEREK WARDLAW — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

MARINO, et al. — RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A EXTRAORDINARY WRIT

United States District Court Central District of California
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR EXTRAORDINARY WRIT

Derek Wardlaw
(Your Name)

DSP 2989 West Rock Quarry Rd
(Address)

Buford, GA 30519
(City, State, Zip Code)

(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

Why was there a Treaty of Versailles Violation?
Why did intellectual property fraud, and theft occur?

Questions of unnecessary hardships
How did a bill of attainder aid to unlawful detainer, and False imprisonment after a illegal extradition?

Why was the Ist Amendment Freedom of speech curtailed, by local Nationals?

Why was Religion of Petitioner targeted negatively, in violation of the Ist Amendment?

Why was Biological warfare, and Chemical warfare used against an All American Soldier Veteran, and why is that pattern of punishment dictated against the veteran?

Why did illegal punishment occur?

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:

Juan Merino

Ming Chen

Thomas J. Alexander

PTS, LLC (Workers, Names Unknown)

Norvie L. White

Dennis Bullock 03/3/14

Turner 03/19/14

Jigar S. Shah // OXC OXP 3PT UNCOOP SGT. SHAW

Lester Scruggs

Danny A. Bass

Chandra D. Appling

Stokes (Full name unknown)

Appling (Full name unknown)

David Jared

Grace Spence

Ira Edwards

Gordon L. Sims

Viola L. Stephens

Gladys Mack

Rebecca S. Bartfield

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION.....	
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	
CONCLUSION.....	

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	California Central District Courts decision on illegal extradition.
APPENDIX B	Petition Requesting Formal Inquiry decision.
APPENDIX C	XIV Amendment Overview, from CA.
APPENDIX D	Order of State Appeals Court Denying Rehearing of a Coparty.
APPENDIX E	Order of Referral never consented to, by a coparty.
APPENDIX F	Active Duty wrongful discharge claim, U.S. Army Review Board status identifying moving party's veteran status.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

Lust v. Merrel Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc., 89 F.3d 594, 598 (9th Cir. 1996)...	pg. 2 of Statement
In re Paoli R.R. Yard PCB Litig., F.3d 717, 745 (3d Cir. 1994)...	35 pg. 2 of Statement
Donald L. Meek v. County of Riverside 183 F.3d 962 (Cal. 1999)...	pg. 4 of Statement
Lacy Panion and Gary Panion vs. The United States of America, 385 F.Supp. 2d 1071 (Hawaii 2005)...	pg. 5 of Statement

STATUTES AND RULES

Bill of Rights...	pg. 6 of Statement
Rule 13 (g) and (e) Counterclaim and Crossclaim, Crossclaim Against a Coparty...	pg. 3 of Statement
Supremacy Clause, Treaty of Versailles...	pg. 1 of Provisions
... and ...	pg. 3 of Statement
Torture Victim Protection Act of 1991...	pg. 8 of Statement
28 U.S.C. § 1350 (b) Torture (2), (D)...	pg. 8 of Statement
(VCAA) Veterans Claims Assistance Act, 38 U.S.C. § 5103A Duty to Assist Claimants...	pg. 7 of Statement

OTHER

Plagiarism...	pg. 7 of Statement
Misrepresentation...	pg. 7 of Statement
Material Alteration...	pg. 7 of Statement
Alienation of Affection...	pg. 7 of Statement

pg. 1 of 3

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

Robert Lee Marion v. Robert T. LaFargue M.D. (2004)	pg. 4 of Statement
Carolyn T. Wade v. Bethesda Hospital et al., 356 F.Supp. 380 (Ohio 1973)	pg. 4 of Statement
United States v. Madden, 221 F.App'x 915, 918 (11th Cir. 2007)	pg. 4 of Statement
United States v. Clarke, 274 F.3d 1325, 1326 (11th Cir. 2001)	pg. 4 of Statement
Koenig v. North Dakota, 755 F.3d 636, 642 (8th Cir. 2014)	pg. 7 of Statement
North Carolina v. Pearce	pg. 7 of Statement
United Nations Convention Against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CAT) Dec. 10, 1984 1465 U.N.T.S. 85, 23. ILM 1027. pg. 8 of Statement	
Mills v. District of Columbia 571 F.3d 1304, 1312, 387 U.S. App. D.C. 221 (D.C. Cir. 2009)	pg. 7 of Statement

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

OTHER

PAGE NUMBER

William H. Rehnquist, All the laws But One:
Civil Liberties in Wartime, 205 (1998). pg 6 of Statement
Fraud on the Market Theory. pg 3 of Statement

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PETITION FOR EXTRAORDINARY WRIT

Petitioner respectfully prays that a extraordinary writ 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 D to the petition and is

☒ is unpublished.

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

☒ is unpublished.

JURISDICTION

☒ For cases from federal courts:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was February 26, 2018.

☒ A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: March 26, 2018, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix D.

The Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

- + Treaty of Versailles. PIBN 1000449014
Library of Congress O 020 953 405 8
Pg 23 reparation commission ... 2. Damage to civilian persons, caused by Germany or her allies, by act of cruelty, violence, or maltreatment — including injuries to life or health as a consequence of imprisonment, deportation, internment, or evacuation, of exposure at sea or of being forced to labor — wherever arising, and to the surviving dependents of such victims... 7. Allowances by the Governments of the Allies and associated powers to the families and dependents of mobilized persons or persons serving in the forces, ...
- + Supremacy Clause. A clause in Article VI of the U.S. Constitution that declares the Constitution, laws, ~~and~~ treaties of the federal government to be the Supreme law of the land, to which judges in every state are bound regardless of state law to the contrary.
- + U.S. Constitution.
Amendment IX (Inalienable Rights). The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

- + U.S. Constitution.
Amendment ~~VIII~~ ... nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.
- + U.S. Constitution.
Amendment ~~II~~ ... nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.
- + U.S. Constitution.
Amendment I. Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.
- + U.S. Constitution.
Amendment ~~XIV~~ section 1. ... No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor...
- + Dodd - Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, 124 Stat. 1376 (2010)
... "Consumer Financial Protection Bureau" (for protecting consumers from abusive or deceptive financial practices)...
- + Wire Fraud Act, 18 U.S.C. § 1343 (1952) ... have also been interpreted broadly by the courts as devices to use in prosecuting corrupt state and local officials who have abused their offices and deprived citizens of their right to honest government.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

+ U.S. Constitution.

Amendment ~~XVI~~. Section I. The eighteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States, is hereby repealed.

+ U.S. Constitution.

Amendment ~~XVIII~~, section 1 ... Manufacture, sale, or transportation of intoxicating liquors within, the importation thereof into, or the exportation thereof from the United States and all territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof for beverage purposes is hereby prohibited.

+ Repeal ~~vi-~~pell vt Anglo-French repeler, From Old French, from re-back + ~~epeler~~ to appeal, call, from Latin, *appellare* to address, entreat, call by name I: to rescind or annul by authoritative act; esp: to revoke or abrogate by legislative enactment < legislatures ~ing statutes in light of a recent Supreme Court decision > — repeal n

+ Chain of causation: the casual connection between an original cause and its subsequent effects esp. as a basis for criminal or civil liability

< intervening acts of third parties will not break the Chain of Causation — Brownell v. Fiegel, 950 F.2d 1285 (1991) > — see also NEXUS

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

First: the lower court in Georgia never recognized my intrajudicial Immunities to begin with in 2008, stolen intellectual property in intoxicating liquors advertisement for manufacture, sale, and transportation took place, as a chain of causation began. A lower court in Florida never recognized Petitioner's Fiduciary Shield Doctrine, further adding to hardship. Aiding the disqualification of Petitioner of any positions in government type work, or any office Petitioner could hold in the future. Combative belligerents targeted Petitioner and allies in civilian areas with weapons in violation of the Wire Fraud Act, 18 U.S.C. § 1343 (1952) and their methods can be scrutinized by applying principles involved, see *Cast v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc.*, 89 F.3d 594, 598 (9th Cir. 1996), "Scrutinizing not only the principles and methods used by the expert, but also whether those principles and methods have been properly applied..." As well as *In re Paoli R.R. Yard PCB Litig.*, 35 F.3d 717, 745 (3d Cir. 1994), "any step that renders the

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

analysis unreliable... renders the experts testimony inadmissible. This is true whether the step completely changes a reliable methodology or merely misapplies that methodology. False profiles, illegal inverse propaganda warfare utilized by local nationals, and other abusive tactics.

That laying the foundation for an illegal extradition from the county of Los Angeles, California, and used after a sexual assault took place targeting the Petitioner twice in a state contracted facility, located in Los Angeles California. The Petitioner had to deal with other sexual type harassment after illegal extradition in Georgia, adding to further losses of interest. Some torture happened to Petitioner in Georgia, and Petitioner was taken hostage by local national terrorists claiming immunity, Georgia, and the USA. The Petitioner was sold into punishment to contractors working as accomplice with AXIS German represented facilities. AXIS

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

German Camera Systems representation located throughout facilities. Paid for by State of Georgia representatives, and others. Contracts for a job that was entrusted to Georgia's representatives. Illegal lower court action beginning the transaction.

The Central Powers type facilities sprouting up around the same time as the theft of the Petitioner's intellectual properties 2008, and oil price fluctuations. In point or on point. But technically: also a Treaty of Versailles violation. Like the Petitioner having family in U.S. Navy during WWII that were mobilized persons or persons serving in the forces. We families, and dependents injured by any or "all the direct consequences thereof. Fraud on the market theory, even for adverse advertising.

Now the Rule 13 (g) and (e) Counterclaim and Crossclaim. Crossclaim Against a Coparty. "... any claim by one party against a coparty..." individuals noted in Appendix D and E as well as list of parties as coparty to individuals listed in Appendix A. "... the crossclaim may include a claim that the coparty is or may be liable to the cross-claimant for all or part of a claim..." Also (e) Counterclaim Maturing or Acquired after Pleading Can occur. (Coerced pleadings?)

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Petitioner was also subject to anti-religious programming in violation of the 1st Amendment rights. The case *Donald L. Meek v. County of Riverside*, 183 F.3d 962 (Cal. 1999) it noted judge is not immune from liability for non-judicial action, or for actions taken in "clear absence" of all jurisdiction. The Treaty of Versailles being violated by lower court representatives and accessories implicates their liability. In *Carolyn T. Wade v. Bethesda Hospital et al*, 356 F.Supp. 380 (Ohio 1973) the court held that the judge was not judicially immune because he acted without jurisdiction. The court also held that the doctor and hospital were not immune as court functionaries. Petitioner had combatants attempt to chemically castrate him, altering G.U. tract temporarily, the same liability can be applied. Petitioner has been targeted medically because Petitioner's father was a doctor, M.D., and ~~combatants~~ want to seize property and resources in that field, hitting Petitioner's front lines - maximizing collateral damage.

The case *United States v. Madden*, 221 F. App'x 915, 918, (11th Cir. 2007) (citing *United States v. Clarke*, 274 F.3d 1325, 1326 (11th Cir. 2001)) In any event whether there were non-frivolous grounds for an appeal,

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

or whether an appeal would of been proper, adequate consultation, with a non - Fake Counsel as to make an educated decision concerning the exercise of appellate rights. No such consultation took place in this case. Grounds for Extraordinary Circumstance declaration amassing for Petitioner.

In, Lacy Panion and Gary Panion vs. The United States of America, 385 F.Supp. 2d 1071 (Hawaii 2005) their claim was a terror claim where abuse took place at an Army Hospital and The Panions recieved a money settlement. Petitioner has been targeted because of previous Army Service, in the "war on terror." Combatants try to link Petitioner to the trendy infamous word terror. In order to redirect government funding to aid in waring on Petitioner, Petitioner's U.S. Army State, and other allies. In a State that the Supreme Court of the U.S. is already suing over the Psycho Education Schools of Georgia Administrative Procedures Act, A.K.A. APA violations. Look at "A. Psychological Association." A precursor to the "Unsane" movie, mad pride and a psychological survivor's movement.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The same APT type group that looked to discredit a President Donald Trump. Just on a complex macro type level for a more well known person, and a micro level for Petitioner.

see William H. Rehnquist, All the laws But One: Civil Liberties in Wartime 205 (1998) stating that "[j]udicial inquiry" is "ill-sated" to address issues of "Military necessity" this statement is surely more true of lower courts compared to Supremacies of the U.S.A. decided in The Supreme Court of the U.S.A., extraordinary circumstances again noted. Petitioner's Bill of Rights were totally ignored, exasperating the situation.

There were material misrepresentations regarding a security traded in the open market architected by combative local nationals targeting Petitioner. And architecting suffering for the Petitioner to relieve. Stemming from a Munchausen Syndrome by Proxy and Contractor. Treatment warfare.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Petitioner purchased a Digital CD while in a state building through a Kiosk. Some sort of AI or program altered the CD purchased, Wartime Memories - 100 hits CD by multiple artists. There are 9 tracks noted as altered all about 1:00 minutes in length. Plagiarism, misrepresentation of artists, Material Alteration also. For the artists it would be an alienation of affection. The tracks had an Army type cadence, but altered seemed to target Petitioner. This evidence the Petitioner has currently in digital format.

The Veterans Claims Assistance Act, 38 U.S.C. § 5103A Duty to Assist Claimants. Could be used by the Court for Petitioner.

It has long been established loss of Constitutional freedoms, for even minimal periods of time, unquestionably constitutes irreparable injury. *Mills v. District of Columbia*, 571 F.3d 1304, 1312, 387 U.S. App. D.C. 221 (D.C. Cir. 2009).

If out of time appeal is not granted, Conviction Vacated. *Koenig v. North Dakota*, 755 F.3d 636, 642 (8th Cir. 2014).

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

United Nations Convention Against Torture
and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading
treatment or Punishment (CAT) Dec. 10, 1984,
1465 U.N.T.S. 85.23. I.L.M. 1027.

There is "no excuse for torture"

There is a Torture Victim Protection
Act of 1991. 28 U.S.C. § 1350 (b) Torture (2)(D)
which is implicated in Petitioner's Claim.

Conditions add up to create an overall
Unconstitutional Situation. *Palmer v. Johnson*, 193
F.3d 346 (5th Cir. 1999)

18 U.S.C. § 894 Collection of extensions
of credit by extortionate means is illegal.
Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and
Consumer Protection Act, 124 Stat. 1376 (2010)
protecting consumers from abusive or
deceptive financial practices. Like selling
contracts to third party collectors that
had nothing to do with the original contracts.

They had cheated Petitioner very
explicitly. Prosecutorial Assassination. The
Fruit of the poisonous tree concept, Petitioner's
Chain of causation implicated.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Exceptional Circumstances warrant the Exercise of the Supreme Court of the United States of America. For if no decision made by said Court on the matter Petitioner and other soldiers could do similar actions, policing courts, Security, and ~~every~~ policing forces in areas to attain a solution. Viewing the situation as lower courts legalize torture, chemical warfare, biological warfare, and acquire convictions through sham legal processes, coercion, and corruption. All of the lower courts have failed diplomacy so far.

That seems to be an Exceptional circumstance, also dangerous lower courts failing diplomacy, when they should be working for the Independence of All American Soldiers. Instead of acting like enemies.

By leaving the situation in limbo and legalizing cruel and unusual punishment that would technically come into conflict with many other decisions of the United States Court of Appeals and their matters. Also dangerous, and would weigh heavily against Civil Rights. As more inverse propaganda proceeds destroying Petitioner's, and other allies credibility.

Specific Relief being sought. Rule 20

Petitioner prays for Mandamus Relief.

Mandamus to command the performance to enforce the Petitioner's Constitutional Rights.

CONCLUSION

The Petition for a Extraordinary Writ should be granted.

Respectfully Submitted,
Dack Wardlaw

Date May 13, 2018

**Additional material
from this filing is
available in the
Clerk's Office.**