

No. _____

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

Patrick Christian – PETITIONER

Vs.

United States of America, et. al. – RESPONDENTS

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE 4TH
CIRCUIT**

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Patrick Christian
Pro Se IFP Matter
Displaced with no address
77patrickchrist@gmail.com
No telephone number

QUESTIONS TO BE PRESENTED

1. In the American Judicial System does the treatment of Pro Se IFP Parties fit the definition of "Discrimination"?
2. What is "frivolous and malicious" about "Protected Citizens" demanding redress after support of wrongdoing is provided?
3. Is over 92% of Pro Se IFP Civil Rights Complaints dismissed?
4. In a legal proceeding is the evidence filed in exhibits important in opining judgment or not so important?
5. What is more validating and affirming than answering the legal questions posed in law, and is failure to do so a correctable error?
6. Can City or State Officials abridge the Constitution during the performance of their duties?

LIST OF PARTIES

[v]

Are Parties to the Proceeding in the court whose judgment is the subject of this petition is as follows:

United States of America Solicitor General
Department of Justice, Room 5616
950 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, D.C. 20530-0001

Commonwealth State of Virginia
Attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia
919 East Main Street, Suite 1900
Richmond, Virginia 23219

City of Richmond
Allen Jackson, City Attorney
900 East Broad Street, Room 400
Richmond, Virginia 23219

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION	2
QUESTIONS TO BE PRESENTED	3
LIST OF PARTIES	4
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED	5
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS ...	6
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	7
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	8
CONCLUSION	9
PROOF OF SERVICE	10
CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE	11

INDEX OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A Unpublished Order by 4 TH Circuit	12-14
APPENDIX B Order of Dismissal by USEDVA	15-19
APPENDIX C Civil Rights Complaint filed in USEDVA	20-25
APPENDIX D Informal Brief filed in US 4 th Cir.Court	26-29

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

Note that Petitioner did not cite any cases in his Writ of Certiorari, because there are no cases to cite that outline the issue of Discrimination against Pro Se IFP Complainants, Defendants, Plaintiffs, or Petitioners. This case presents the judicial need of review in this MATTER: setting precedence. Furthermore, the cases the court has cited have been remanded for lower court and/or defendant errors and wrongdoing.

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 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 United States district court appears at Appendix B 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 _____ 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 19 April 2018.

☒ 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 _____.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix _____.

☐ 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

United States Constitution, Amendment I – Congress shall make no law prohibiting or abridging...the right of the people..."to petition the government for a redress of grievances".

United States Constitution, Amendment XIV, Section 1. – All persons born...in the U.S., and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the U.S. and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge..."nor deny to any person within the jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws".

Constitution of Virginia, Article 1, Bill of Rights, §1: Equality and Rights of men - That all men are by nature equally free...and have certain inherent rights,..."and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety".

The only federal and state discrimination statutes, codes, provisions, and policies apply to employment against race, sex, age, or handicap, reverse discrimination, or other areas where race, age, sex, or handicap is in question, and none outlining or preventing discrimination of Pro Se IFP/non-IFP litigants.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

History, Statistics, Records, norms, cases, practices, and exhausted remedies illustrate the need for legal attention in this case. The "Preferential Treatment" of plaintiffs, complainants, defendants, petitioners with lawyers, and those who are Pro Se IFP/non-IFP Actors in a court of law and the concept of Discrimination they face. Petitioner provided enough evidence to support complaints, yet there was never a discussion of redress, and this introduces the possibility of discrimination, and the question that this Writ of Certiorari poses.

REASON FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

The primary reason for granting this PETITION is due to the fact that over 92% of Pro Se IFP Complaints are dismissed, despite the evidence outlining wrongdoing which give rise to the Complaint for seeking redress of the grievance(s).

The secondary reason is that this type of discrimination has never been addressed in the Judicial Community or Congressional Community; therefore, precedence should be impending.

CONCLUSION

The UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT has always been the main advocate in meeting the fundamental rights of all citizens as society evolved and is evolving. This is another one of those times, since precedence in this specific question of law has never been set, because the question of whether citizenship protection precedes or is precluded by Pro Se IFP Litigation has never been answered. Answering this question is the primary basis this petition for a WRIT OF CERTIORARI should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,


Patrick Christian

Date: 18 June 2018