22-6040



NOV 0 4 2022

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

In Re William Hayes Wyttenbach, a natural living man and not an artificial entity, such as a "person", "individual", "Corporation", "Social Security Trust Account, whose name is a Social Security Number"

Petitioner

v.

Gov. Roy Copper III / North Carolina state

On Petition for Writ of Certiorari To the Fourth Circuit Appellate Case No. 22-1213

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

William Hayes Wyttenbach, living man, presenting himself, as a non artificial entity. c/o: 625 Shore Acres, Salisbury, North Carolina state

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

Question: Has the Fourth Circuit Appellate Court and the lower court violated all three foundational corner stones of Rule of Law; Jurisdiction, Finding of Facts, and Conclusions of Constitutional rule of Law?

Question: Does this U.S. Supreme Court, obey their oath of office, to recognize and adjudicate U.S. Supreme Court precedence law, honoring in their oath; as?

"A law repugnant to the Constitution is void. An act of Congress repugnant to the Constitution cannot become a law. The Constitution supersedes *all other laws*, and the individual's rights shall be liberally enforced in favor of him, the clearly intended and expressly designated beneficiary."

-Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137 (1803) Additional, law. ?

Question: Did these lower courts ignore, Petitioner's fact and conclusion of law, that Petitioner clearly identified himself, as a natural living physical man. and non artificial entity identified above, and that all issues presented, here within, are, and only; Constitutional violations, requiring adjudication in America. which Constitutional Article III court; which is only this honorable United States Supreme Court?

Question: Is it not fact and truth that,...

Penhallow v. Doane's Administrators (3 U.S. 54; 1 Led. 3 Dall. 54/ Supreme Court ruling:

No Corporate jurisdiction over the Natural man; and that, the legal manifestation of this is that no government, as well as any law, agency, aspect, court, etc., can concern itself with anything other than corporate, artificial persons and the contracts between them? (S.C.R. 1795, (3 U.S. 54; 1 L.Ed.57; 3 Dall.54)?

Question: Has the lower trial courts, erred and failed to recognize, this honorable US Supreme Court is the *only* Article III, Constitutional Court of law in this America nation of my birth, to adjudicate, under Constitutional rule of law, this living man's, and every living physical man and woman in America; divine & Constitutional rights; to not be forced under color of law, or by extortion, and/or threat, duress, of loss of divine and Constitutional Right to travel, Right to livelihood?

Question: Is it not truth, per our Constitution 1791/Bill of Rights, that the only clearly identified Article III Constitutional Court is this Honorable U.S. Supreme Court?

Question: Can and will there be the four (4) minimal US Supreme Court Justices, willing, to adjudicate this Petitioner's Writ of Certiorari: regarding three(3)Constitutional rights: (a). Right to Travel (b). Right to Livelihood, (c) ownership of a right living American's to determine autonomy and dominion over their living physical body, to not under threat, duress, coercion to medically harm their body physical body, especially experimental DNA altering, pseudo vaccine/ jab, violating, International Treaty law; Nuremburg code?

Question: Is it not factual, that medically, there was never a lethal pandemic that required any emergency response and authorization of a mRNA; (Exhibit 5); untested bogus alleged vaccine, twofold; because covid-19 was never produced in a lab; its test was bogus PCR was so highly cycled, it produced over a 90 % false positive results, and most importantly, only a 99.9x% survival statistical rate?

Question: Is it not factual, that the U.S. Supreme Court case of Jacobson v. Massachusetts, U.S; February 20, 1905, has absolutely, no validity in this century, 117 years later?

Will this Question: honorable U.S. Supreme Court upon in the debt of right action, grant this Petition for Writ of Certiorari, review closely this physician's medical research, double blind studies, peer medical facts: reviewed. not opinions: Masks,... physically hurt and harm & they protect! Physically masks metaphor, like putting a chain link fence in your back yard, to keep mosquitoes out?

Question: Will this honorable US Supreme court, via Justices that are not political party biased, and whom have the integrity to obey and adjudicate US original de jure Constitutional rule of law, (with its roots in common law, no civil or criminal victim, no violation of law), do so with honor?

will this Question: honorable USSupreme court, uphold Constitutional rule of forthwith, law, and Order and Grant sought,...emergency Petitioner's and permanent national Injunctions against color of law mask wearing mandates, and, color of mandates under threat. coercion, mandating a Covid non emergency, experimental vax/jab. altering a living human's DNA/genetics, "passport" violating right to livelihood and right to travel?

Question: Justice Sonia Sotomayor made false irresponsible claims statements regarding Covid-19 in a vaccine mandates, hearing, clearly using her false statements attempting to sway case to support vaccine mandates; there was never "over a 100,000

Children, in serious conditions and many on ventilators"; while the opposite is true, children have little to no risk from Covid-19; therefore, should because of the bias

Demonstrated by Justice Sotomayor, it begs the question should Justice Sotomayor Recuse herself from any involvement of this Petitioner's case?

Question: Does this honorable U.S. Supreme Court fully acknowledge that the CDC is an unelected, non-government, unlawful agency, and recent "a CDC committee, voted to add these experimental shots, attempting to fraudulently extort parents/children that if my injunction is not granted, children will be denied public school attendance rights, without a vax passport, by a physician's office?

This natural living physical man Petitioner humbly asks this Supreme Court, that it accepts and adjudicates this Petition for Writ of Certiorari, and finds that all above questions presented are valid and this honorable US Supreme Court accepts and grants this Petition.

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS

Petitioner in the Action:

William Hayes Wyttenbach, natural living man, non artificial entity; pro se a man presenting himself

Respondent: N. C. Gev. Roy Cooper, III.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents
QUESTIONS PRESENTED2
PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING5
TABLE OF CONTENTS6
TABLE OF AUTHORITES 6
OPINIONS9
JURISDICTION9
CONSTITUTION PROVISIONS9
STATEMENT OF THE CASE10
REASON TO GRANT THIS WRIT13
CONCLUSION14
CERTIFCATE OF SERVICE15
APPENDIX16
TABLE OF AUTHORITITIES
SUPREME COURT UNITIED STATES/ PRESCENCE LAW/ CASES;
"A law repugnant to the Constitution is void. An act of

Congress repugnant to

the

Constitution cannot become a law. The Constitution supersedes all other laws and the individual's rights shall be liberally enforced in favor of him, the clearly intended and expressly designated beneficiary." –Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137 (1803)

"An unconstitutional law is void and is as no law. An offense created by it is not crime. A conviction under it is not merely erroneous but is illegal and void and cannot be used as a legal cause of imprisonment." – Ex parte Siebold, 100 U.S. 371 (1879)

"An unconstitutional act is not law. It confers no rights; it imposes no duties; affords no protection; it creates no office. It is, in legal contemplation, as inoperative as though it had never been passed." – Norton v. Shelby County, 118 U.S. 425 (1886)

"Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule-making or legislation which would abrogate them." –Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436 (1966)

"The general misconception is that any statute passed by legislators bearing the appearance of law constitutes the law of the land. The

U.S. Constitution is the supreme law of the land, and any statue, to be valid, must be in agreement. It is impossible for both the Constitution and a law violating it to be valid; one must prevail. This is succinctly stated as follows: The general rule is that an unconstitutional statute, though having the form and name of law, is in reality no law, but is wholly void, and ineffective for anv purpose; since unconstitutionality dates from the time of its enactment, and not merely from the date of the decision branding it. An unconstitutional law, in legal contemplation, is inoperative as if it had never been passed. Such a statute leaves the question that it purports to settle just as it would be had the statute not been enacted.

"Since an unconstitutional void, the general principals follow that it imposes no duties, confers no rights, creates no office, bestows no power or affords authority on anyone, and justifies protection, no acts performed under it...A void act cannot be legally consistent with a valid one. An unconstitutional law cannot operate to supersede any existing valid law.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF

CERTIORARI

Petitioner William Wyttenbach respectfully submits this petition for a Writ of Certiorari.

OPINIONS BELOW

NA the lower trial courts only refused any and per curium

JURISDICTION

Only, Article III Court, The united States Constitution of 1791/ Bill of Rights, this honorable, United States of America Article III Supreme Court

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION INVOLVED

The Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution contain a due process clause. Due process deals with the administration of justice and thus the due process clause acts as a safeguard from arbitrary denial of life, liberty, or property by the Government outside of the sanction of law. The U.S.

Constitution, Article III, Section 2: Jurisdiction.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This Petitioner has decades of experience as a trained Medical Doctor; Anesthesiologist & ER physician, over 40 years. I am expert in human airways, physiology, & pathogen pathology. I have studied Constitutional rule of law for decades, and as an honorably discharged, Major, USAF; I took an oath to uphold our Constitution of our united States of America.

I know the difference of color of law and Constitutional rule of law. And that, Constitutional precedence law; "A law repugnant to the Constitution is void. The Constitution supersedes *all other laws*, and the individual's rights shall be liberally enforced in favor of him, the clearly intended and expressly designated beneficiary."-Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137 (1803)

seek and emergency permanent from Injunctions. this honorable Supreme Court to correct Constitutional rights violations: As a physical living American as myself cannot be extorted under threat, duress, coercion by color of law, be made to wear a mask, that peer reviewed double blind studies prove that, medically physically harms a human being; as well as medical studies proven there is no protection whatsoever. Our Constitution does not *allow* a human living human being to be forced to hurt and harm themselves!

I lost employment (Right to Livelihood), because of Chewy, Inc. mandating under color of law, Respondent's color of law, non-medically supported mask mandate. Chewy, Inc. also refused to honor, Petitioner's religious/spiritual exemption Affidavit, Administrative leave without pay. (Violation of Constitutional Right of Livelihood).

In exhibits in Petitioner's NC USDC case 2021-cv-704; details de facto medical mask studies in the record, as well as detailed depth exposing what was in this bogus experimental, Nuremberg violating, human DNA altering, "jab"/vax shot, is toxic, as well as, many physicians, including myself, alters a Homo Sapien, to "Homo Borgis Genesis / transhumanism; no longer, a pure human being.

Again, under extortion of no livelihood by an employer, threat, duress and coercion, to "take the jab", have a "vax passport" to travel/work. In my situation, having an active CDL-A license to drive 18 wheeler tractor-trailers; yet a "vax passport" limited my right to work and travel under bogus color of law.

Furthermore, this honorable U.S. Supreme court is the *only* Constitutional Article III court in America, therefore as the only Article III Constitutional court,

constitutionally mandated to adjudicate above detailed Constitutional violations of Petitioner's Constitutional Rights.

Currently, *all* courts in America are, Constitutional Article I Courts, and not Article III Courts.

Since de facto, Article I "legislative courts" are selected by political parties, which are inherently prejudiced and biased factors; Factually, Respondent Roy Cooper, III is in democrat party, as is Judges, Eagles USDC; 3 assigned Fourth Circuit Court Judges....all politically Democratic legislatively appointed; in Petitioning for Rehearing; seeking hopefully, Constitutional rule of law adjudication; none stepped up to the plate to rule under Constitutional rule of law. This may have occurred due to awareness noticed, that they are indeed solely Article I legislative appointed judges, and since not a Article III identified Constitutional Court: additionally, the 7 active Republican party appointed Federal Appellate judges, refused to adjudicate Petition for rehearing en banc.

Additionally, the U.S. Supreme Court case of *Jacobson v. Massachusetts, U.S; February 20, 1905*, has absolutely, no validity in this century, a 117 years later.

Poor human hygiene & conditions, no plumbing, poor nutrition, no vitamin supplements, human life expectancy 40 plus/minus years old; medical science in its

infancy. It was inoculations, powdered scabs blown up nostrils in China, hundreds of years earlier, later, smallpox pus exposed to peat smoke, buried in ground with camphor up to 8 years, then using a knife inserting it under the skin. The 117 year old case does not apply today in 2022.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THIS WRIT OF CERTIORARI

That through Constitutional Rule of law my Divine rights be respected and honored; I cannot be made through fraudulent color of law & through extortion of threat, duress and coercion be denied my constitutional rights, to not be forced to hurt and harm my physical body by wearing a mask that medically harms and does not protect my living human body; That my freedom of choice with harm to none is not stolen to make me a slave under color of law, to deny my Divine and constitutional rights to work, to provide myself and those I love, right to livelihood, right to refuse an experimental DNA altering drug into my dangerous temple. body physical; my

That my right to travel is preserved and no bogus, vax/ jab drug "passport" is to hinder my labor livelihood, and freedom to travel.

CONCLUSION

Our United States of America, Constitution 1791/ Bill of rights de Jure, created by our wise forefathers; was and is a contract with We the People, to preserve and protect our divine tights, reflected in our Constitutional rights. It was created for American human living peoples, and *not*, artificial, non-living entities, such as corporations, and or trusts, such as a Social Security Trust account, individually named as Social Security numbers.

As we are a Republic, rule of law, our U.S. Constitution is Supreme rule of law in America, and this honorable Supreme Court is the *only Constitutional* Article III court, all other Federal courts are Article I, legislative courts.

This natural born living man, American invokes this only Article III constitutional court, to properly adjudicate Constitutional rule of law only.

This living man Petitioner requests his request for Permanent Injunctions be granted and ordered. How my Constitutional rights have been violated by Respondent NC Gov. Roy Cooper, III, by color of law, and not substantiated by factual medical science!

Color of law, should constitutionally, not one instant further, to "mandate masks" which

Chramatic Shalum-Anna-Marie Sharum Exp 3 March 2023 hurts and harms, myself and other humans to ever exist again.

well allowing as, more no experimental drug which alters Human DNA; be used to extort, under threat, duress and coercion, violating my Constitutional and others rights to Livelihood, and right to Travel"; this living man Petitioner, and millions of living Americans have been damaged, harmed by these blatant. Constitutional violations! In the debt of unconstitutional rights violations, Article I federal judges, plainly adjudicating under major & prejudice political parties loyalties adjudication of and bias no Constitutional rule of law... Injunctions only affect mandates under color of law. If a living man woman desires to wear a mask, gives true consent, for an experimental DNA altering drug, that with consent is their free will.. that's their choice.

This living man Petitioner, prays this honorable U.S. Supreme Court Justices, ignore political party affiliations, and *only* properly, adjudicate Constitutional rule of law, in your hearts and Souls.

Accordingly, the petition for Writ of Certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ William Hayes Wyttenbach

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I affirm via USPS, Express mail: EJ 335 342 975 US to: Clerk: Supreme Court of

OrnoMalie Gladem
Anna-Marie Stabum
Exp 3 Mach 2023
Rewon Chy NC

united States of America; 1 First Street, N.E.; Washington, DC 20543-0001 and

USPS: Priority mail:

Defendants counsel: for Defendant NC Roy Cooper, III; legal Counsel, Mr. Orlando L. Rodeiquez, c/o: NC Dept of Justice P.O.Box 629, Raleigh, N.C. near # 27602-0629

William H. Wyttenbach, living physical man and not an artificial entity as detailed above. c/o: 625 Shore Acres, North Carolina near # 28146

APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

- (1) Order Mandate of NC Fed USDC middle District: September 28, 2022/Exhibit A
- (2) Order Mandate: Temporary Stay of Mandate August 31st, 2022 Exhibit B
- (3) Judgment August 22, 2022 & unpublished Per Curiam Exhibit C
- (4) Exhibit D Exposing Fraud of jab/vax

Exhibit Current situation medical references of toxicity of Experimental and deadly Pfizer and Moderna poisonous bogus vaccines: