

No.22-6123

In The
Supreme Court Of The United States

BRIAN DAVID HILL,
Petitioner,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Respondent,

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to
the United States Court of Appeals for
the Fourth Circuit

**EMERGENCY MOTION FOR REVIEW AND
DISQUALIFICATION OF AFFECTED HONORABLE
CHIEF JUSTICE JOHN ROBERTS WITH ACTUAL OR
PERCEIVED CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

Brian David Hill
Pro Se

Ally of Q, and Atty. Lin Wood
Former USWGO Alternative News Reporter

310 FOREST STREET, APARTMENT 2
MARTINSVILLE, VIRGINIA 24112

Tel.: (276) 790-3505

E-Mail: c/o Roberta Hill at rbhill67@comcast.net

Dated: December 2, 2022



U.S.W.G.O.

JusticeForUSWGO.wordpress.com

JusticeForUSWGO.NL //

USWGO.COM

RECEIVED

DEC - 6 2022

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

**EMERGENCY MOTION FOR REVIEW AND
DISQUALIFICATION OF AFFECTED HONORABLE
CHIEF JUSTICE JOHN ROBERTS WITH ACTUAL OR
PERCEIVED CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

To all of the Honorable Justices of the Supreme Court of the
United States:

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 21.2(c) and 28 USC § 455,
Petitioner Brian David Hill hereby moves for review and
disqualification of any Justice with actual or potential conflicts of
interest (or the appearance of same) “however small” as the statute
reads, with supported evidence in the attached Appendix. No affidavit
is available unless Attorney L. Lin Wood is compelled by this Supreme
Court to file a separate response or file a Declaration under oath in
response to this EMERGENCY MOTION’s request that Chief Justice
John Roberts recuse himself.

Petitioner Brian David Hill respectfully requests that Chief
Justice John Roberts recuse himself from participation at all stages of
the proceedings from Petitioner’s accompanying Petition for Writ of
Certiorari, the foregoing case.

Note: Petitioner requests that this Court order a response
directly from Attorney L. Lin Wood to explain about his claims against
Chief Justice John Roberts to ascertain the credibility of his claims
prior to disposition of this EMERGENCY MOTION. He can file an

Affidavit or Declaration about why he made those claims against John Roberts and as to the credibility of his claims and vetting how those claims came to be. Attorney Lin Wood should be questioned by this Supreme Court before this EMERGENCY MOTION is denied or granted. Petitioner respectfully requests that.

SUMMARY OF MOTION

This Court has jurisdiction for Petitioner's EMERGENCY MOTION under Supreme Court Rule 21.2(c) and 28 USC § 455.

As set forth in the attached APPENDIX in attachment to this EMERGENCY MOTION, Petitioner explains how the Honorable Chief Justice John Roberts must recuse himself.

With the facts in support of this EMERGENCY MOTION, Petitioner states as follows:

1. The Petition for the Writ of Certiorari is over a final judgment/order of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit. This EMERGENCY MOTION is only to address an issue of significant emergency importance for Chief Justice Roberts, and must be addressed before any proceedings begin in Petitioner's case for petition for Writ of Certiorari.

2. The Petition for Writ of Certiorari was timely filed on November 7, 2022, and docketed on November 21, 2022. This issue must be addressed before the petition is distributed to the justices after the written response from the Respondent and/or reply from Petitioner if necessary, unless government waives right to respond as usual.

3. This EMERGENCY MOTION is extremely important due to issues of a criminal nature (blackmail scheme, child rape and murder allegation) which personally affect the facts surrounding the request for a Special Master which includes the allegation against Chief Justice John Roberts allegedly by Attorney L. Lin Wood. The allegation in records of this appealed case and his name over issues of blackmail as alleged by Attorney Lin Wood in his tweets in the case. This attorney is compelled to tell the truth over the internet, pursuant to RULE 7.1 of the Georgia Rules of Professional Conduct.

See Citation.

RULE 7.1 COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING A LAWYER'S SERVICES

A lawyer shall not make a false or misleading communication about the lawyer or the lawyer's services. By way of illustration, but not limitation, a communication is false or misleading if it:
contains a material misrepresentation of fact or law or omits a fact necessary to make the statement considered as a whole not materially misleading;

is likely to create an unjustified expectation about results the lawyer can achieve, or states or implies that the lawyer can achieve results by means that violate the Georgia Rules of Professional Conduct or other law;

compares the lawyer's services with other lawyers' services unless the comparison can be factually substantiated;

fails to include the name of at least one lawyer responsible for its content; or

contains any information regarding contingent fees, and fails to conspicuously present the following disclaimer:

"Contingent attorneys' fees refers only to those fees charged by attorneys for their legal services. Such fees are not permitted in all types of cases. Court costs and other additional expenses of legal action usually must be paid by the client."

contains the language "no fee unless you win or collect" or any similar phrase and fails to conspicuously present the following disclaimer:

"No fee unless you win or collect" [or insert the similar language used in the communication] refers only to fees charged by the attorney. Court costs and other additional expenses of legal action usually must be paid by the client. Contingent fees are not permitted in all types of cases.

A public communication for which a lawyer has given value must be identified as such unless it is apparent from the context that it is such a communication.

A lawyer retains ultimate responsibility to insure that all communications concerning the lawyer or the lawyer's services comply with the Georgia Rules of Professional Conduct.

4. John Roberts has a personal interest or conflict of interest in the outcome of the foregoing case, including any resolution or dismissal of this final appeal to this Supreme Court from the Fourth Circuit's decision refusing to take action on the appeals requesting remand of the order/decision denying the motion for a Special Master

and Motion to Reconsider the order/decision denying the motion for a Special Master.

5. Whether or not John Roberts may or may not be in one of the alleged blackmail videos as claimed by Attorney L. Lin Wood, it is still a CONFLICT OF INTEREST and gives appearance on its face that it is a CONFLICT OF INTEREST whether John Roberts is guilty or innocent of the criminal act that Attorney L. Lin Wood had alleged of Chief Justice John Roberts in printed Twitter tweets of Attorney Lin Wood making the allegations against the Chief Justice. He is making those claims as an officer of the court system, as an attorney, and did not make any such disclaimer that the claims may not be true at face value. This attorney made such claims against John Roberts and can be held liable under RULE 7.1 of the Georgia Rules of Professional Conduct, if he had lied about John Roberts on Twitter last year. Petitioner will make one disclaimer, and that is the internet materials were printed by the family members of Brian D. Hill, the Petitioner in this case and the Petitioner does not need to use the internet to have this evidence. This evidence is locally in PDF files on a computer without internet access. That is the only disclaimer Petitioner feels must be addressed in this EMERGENCY MOTION.

6. This issue is too important that it must be addressed before the Petition for the Writ of Certiorari is considered by this Court to be

granted or denied. Federal law makes it clear, as well as ethics of the Canons of Judicial Conduct, that no justice or judge should be partial or have an interest in the outcome of any case even if it is an appeal such as the final appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court. A justice cannot have an interest in the outcome of a case which involves the issues and facts of a personal nature or criminal nature or both directly involving the justice in question.

7. The U.S. Supreme Court has the authority to require recusal of a justice with a conflict of interest or an appearance of a conflict of interest pursuant to 28 U.S. Code § 455 - Disqualification of justice, judge, or magistrate judge. Congress created this law specifically to recuse or disqualify a justice, judge, or magistrate judge under specific circumstances. Says in section **“(a) Any justice, judge, or magistrate judge of the United States shall disqualify himself in any proceeding in which his impartiality might reasonably be questioned.”**

28 U.S. Code § 455 also says under the law that **“(b) He shall also disqualify himself in the following circumstances: (1) Where he has a personal bias or prejudice concerning a party, or personal knowledge of disputed evidentiary facts concerning the proceeding...”**

8. If a single Justice in a case has a CONFLICT OF INTEREST, prejudice, has an personal or ethical interest or issue in the outcome

of a case which may negatively affect that involved justice, or has a bias then he must disqualify himself as a matter of law.

8. The following appealed consolidated cases being appealed by the Petition for Writ of Certiorari concern the denied Motion requesting a Special Master and denied Motion for Reconsideration of the order denying the Motion requesting a Special Master. Those motions exist because of written statements by Attorney L. Lin Wood who allegedly claimed that “judges” and “officials” were involved as targets of a blackmail scheme of being videotaped committing acts of child rape and murder. This attorney is compelled under the Bar Rules to tell the truth or he risks being sanctioned, disbarred, or penalized by the State Bar of Georgia as a practicing attorney.

9. If this Court were to recognize the truth of Attorney L. Lin Wood’s claims (including against John Roberts) involving this alleged “blackmail scheme” of child rape and murder captured on videotape. That had caused Petitioners’ staggering allegations against the Chief Judge and former Chief Judge, which had further caused the filing of a Motion requesting that the alleged blackmail videos need to be reviewed by a Special Master to determine if Chief Judge Thomas David Schroeder and former Chief Judge William Lindsey Osteen Junior are in any of the blackmail videos. If they are then then causes a big concern as this “attorney from Georgia” may have “John Roberts”

as one of the suspected named individuals who this attorney claimed were “targets of a blackmail scheme” involving child rape and murder.

9. Attorney L. Lin Wood said in writing to the same effect that he mentioned the name CHIEF JUSTICE JOHN ROBERTS as an allegation as alleged by this attorney. He mentioned John Roberts in some of his tweets, and his published photograph of a letter directed to Lin Wood also mentioned Roberts by saying “The first goal is to get Roberts to resign or recuse, and Pence to make the right choice on Jan 6.” So that letter had mentioned about asking Lin Wood to get John Roberts to resign over the alleged blackmail recordings or recuse himself over whatever cases to recuse over, Petitioner does not know, but Lin Wood may know. See APPENDIX (“App.” is page number marker referring to the exact page of attached Appendix to this application) pages numbered App. 3, App. 5, App. 6, App. 8, App. 14, App. 16-18, App. 24 (photograph of John Roberts and Barack Obama under Attorney Lin Wood tweet), App. 30, App. 34-35, App. 46-47, and App. 52.

10. Read all of the Appendix index pages attached to this EMERGENCY MOTION directed to Chief Justice John Roberts, also a circuit assignment to the Fourth Circuit of the U.S. Court of Appeals. Just the very justice Petitioner had filed an application directed to Chief Justice Roberts (filed on November 21, 2022) to

directly and kindly asking that he recuse himself from this entire Certiorari case. He does not need to be involved with or associated with any decisions, or any work dealing with the foregoing Certiorari case because this recusal is necessary even though the main focus was requesting a Special Master to deal with possibly blackmailed compromised federal judges. That was due to the source or sources of Attorney L. Lin Wood who made public statements about all of this on Twitter last year (App. 26, App. 28, App. 30), and such blackmail videos could prove which federal judges are being blackmailed with child rape and murder, it is a CONFLICT OF INTEREST and unethical for Chief Justice John Roberts to be involved with this Certiorari case since he was named by Attorney L. Lin Wood. As of the date of filing this EMERGENCY MOTION, John Roberts has not recused himself and is either ignoring the "Request for recusal" or will not recuse himself after reviewing over the appendix if he even reviewed over the appendix.

11. John Roberts is the only federal jurist or federal justice directly named as an accused of being a target of the blackmail scheme by Attorney L. Lin Wood in this alleged Lizard Squad hacking group obtaining videos of the alleged blackmail scheme. This makes this particular Chief Justice more inclined to sabotage the Certiorari petition case, to prevent the Petition from being granted or discussed

in an impartial manner, or may even attempt to prevent the case from moving forward, or may pull some other stunt which negatively affects the lives of Petitioner and Attorney L. Lin Wood. The risk of possible or probable retaliation by Chief Justice John Roberts is TOO HIGH if he does not automatically recuse himself from proceeding in the foregoing Petition for Writ of Certiorari case, as a matter of law.

12. Petitioner tried to resolve this matter with an application to the individual justice to minimalize this issue being brought before all nine (9) Supreme Court justices, but John Roberts had not made any move to recuse himself as a matter of law as raised in the EMERGENCY APPLICATION filed on November 21, 2022, as the Clerk had dubbed the APPLICATION as the “Request for recusal received from petitioner.”

13. Petitioner requests that this Court order a response directly from Attorney L. Lin Wood to explain about his claims against Chief Justice John Roberts over the alleged “blackmail scheme” concerning acts of child rape and murder to ascertain the credibility of his claims prior to disposition of this EMERGENCY MOTION. He can file an Affidavit or Declaration under oath (under penalty of perjury) about why he made those claims against John Roberts and as to the credibility of his claims about Roberts and vetting how those claims came to be. Of course he has the Fifth Amendment right to remain

silent, but this attorney should at least certify or declare to this Court under penalty of perjury that he at least vetted the evidence or source or sources about his alleged information concerning “John Roberts” and the whole targeting of a child rape blackmail scheme. Attorney Lin Wood should be questioned by this Supreme Court before this EMERGENCY MOTION is denied or granted. Petitioner respectfully requests that. Attorney L. Lin Wood can be contacted at the following information below this paragraph:

Attorney L. Lin Wood, Esq.
GA Bar No. 774588
L. Lin Wood, P.C.
P.O. Box 52584
Atlanta, GA 30355-0584
Telephone: (404) 891-1402
Facsimile: (404) 506-9111
Email: lwood@linwoodlaw.com

14. Petitioner thought that by filing an application on November 21, 2022 asking for recusal from Chief Justice Roberts, that it would have been more appropriate to resolve this issue more discreetly rather than filing a Motion to every justice of this Supreme Court about questioning John Robert’s partiality and/or bias and/or ethics issues over the Certiorari case regarding Petitioner’s request in the U.S. District Court for a Special Master to investigate the “blackmail scheme”. This is very important which is why Petitioner had made the decision that if John Roberts doesn’t voluntarily recuse

himself at all, that this EMERGENCY MOTION would go in front of all honorable justices with the evidence of statements by Attorney L. Lin Wood regarding his alleged claims of John Roberts regarding being a target of blackmail, which caused Petitioner to reiterate the blackmail allegations and claims alleged by Attorney L. Lin Wood in both Petitioner's filed Motion for Special Master (Doc. #294 in the District Court case appealed therefrom) and the Motion to Reconsideration of the order denying the Motion for Special Master (Doc. #301 in the District Court case appealed therefrom), as well as those claims being brought up throughout the appeals. Even the issues such as Attorney Lin Wood's claims causing the Petitioner to have referenced "John Roberts" in his faxed letter to Attorney Lin Wood (App. 6) and referencing Attorney Lin Wood's statements regarding "John Roberts" in various case file documents at issue with the Petition for the Writ of Certiorari case.

15. Petitioner had originally asked the Clerk in his separate initial filing to allow the filed Emergency Application to be forwarded to the Chief Justice as it was directed to Chief Justice John Roberts rather than demand a motion (Citing SCOTUS filing: "Request for recusal received from petitioner." Dated Nov 21 2022) out of respect to John Roberts to resolve this issue without involving every other justice before this Court. Petitioner was hoping Roberts would have

just recused himself which would be a painless process, and with him stepping out of the way, Petitioner can proceed with pushing for a Special Master to investigate whether both the Hon. Chief Judge Thomas David Schroeder and William Lindsey Osteen Junior was or was not in any of the alleged blackmail videos alleged by Attorney L. Lin Wood. Originally the intent of Petitioner was that he only wished to have filed the EMERGENCY APPLICATION to the respect of Chief Justice John Roberts to allow him to voluntarily recuse himself pursuant to 28 U.S. Code § 455 - Disqualification of justice, judge, or magistrate judge. He has still not recused himself and this concerns the Petitioner that now he may be forced to take a direct approach at filing a motion for all justices to review.

16. If the Petitioner files evidence of claims by a credible licensed attorney Lin Wood in this EMERGENCY MOTION in the foregoing case for Petition for a Writ of Certiorari with fears that John Roberts needs to recuse himself or it creates issues of partiality, bias, and conflict of interest, then this EMERGENCY MOTION is the appropriate vehicle under both Rule 21 and 28 U.S. Code § 455.

17. Again, 28 U.S. Code § 455 makes it clear: (a) Any justice, judge, or magistrate judge of the United States shall **disqualify himself in any proceeding in which his impartiality might reasonably be questioned.**

28 U.S. Code § 455 also makes it clear: (“(b)He shall also disqualify himself in the following circumstances: (1)Where he has a personal bias or prejudice concerning a party, or personal knowledge of disputed evidentiary facts concerning the proceeding”).

18. It is clear that because Attorney Lin Wood said on Tweets about the issues surrounding “John Roberts” and alleged “blackmail scheme” which are permanently part of the records of the case of Brian David Hill v. United States of America and in references of the Appeal briefs and Petition for Rehearing, that “John Roberts” is part of “personal knowledge of disputed evidentiary facts concerning the proceeding”. Whether or not John Roberts wishes to admit to what Attorney Lin Wood had accused him of in January, 2021, John Roberts is an American citizen protected under the U.S. Constitution like every other American. He is entitled to the Fifth Amendment where he does not have to be a witness against himself and he does not have to incriminate himself on anything. Regardless of whether Attorney Lin Wood can or cannot actually prove John Roberts was being blackmailed with a heinous sex crime of child rape and then child murder, John Roberts is still entitled to the **presumption of innocence** until ever being charged and ever proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt in a fair trial. Under that circumstance, this issue would be non-existent and he would not be serving as a justice, but Chief Roberts

has not been charged or convicted over anything alleged by Attorney Lin Wood unless fully proven in a court of law. Until that happens, these issues of bias or partiality come into play here for this Certiorari case.

19. However, Attorney Lin Wood has freedom of speech under the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution as long as he is truthful and is not purposefully being defamatory or slandering against another individual by name. He has not ever been disbarred over those claims involving "John Roberts", as far as Petitioner is aware of since the date of filing this EMERGENCY MOTION. Petitioner is not even aware of whether Attorney Lin Wood was even ever been disbarred at all as far as the public record. If John Roberts feels that Attorney Lin Wood is lying or making false remarks, he is free to challenge those claims against Lin Wood by requesting a bar complaint against this attorney and/or John Roberts would have the right as an American citizen to have a civil lawsuit defamation trial against Attorney Lin Wood, and allow both sides to present evidence, arguments, and witnesses. If John Roberts does not wish to pursue any lawsuits against Attorney Lin Wood, that is his right to do so, whatever he legally wishes. He can freely choose to sue Lin Wood or not, and face whatever consequences come as a result of that whether the alleged blackmail evidence exists or whether this evidence does

not exist. If it does then John Roberts has another separate issue to worry about such as possibly criminal charges if the U.S. Department of Justice has any backbone to ever consider a prosecution or requesting impeachment of John Roberts to take away his sovereign immunity from criminal charges. However, this EMERGENCY MOTION still brings this issue and rather ask this Court to compel Honorable Chief Justice John Roberts to recuse himself and the attached evidence now has to be filed in a motion before all justices with the very same alleged claims and evidence of Tweets by Attorney Lin Wood, archived for the entire country of the United States of America and for the entire world to see. Petitioner feels he has no choice but to file this motion.

20. In accordance with Supreme Court Rule 13.1, the foregoing case of the accompanying Petition for Writ of Certiorari was timely filed. This EMERGENCY MOTION to request from all honorable justices to compel recusal of John Roberts is submitted in good faith to ensure that the disqualified justice John Roberts does the right thing under federal law, under 28 U.S. Code § 455. Regardless of John Robert's guilt or innocence to Attorney Lin Wood's alleged claims, John Roberts still must recuse himself from the foregoing Petition for Writ of Certiorari case. A disputed fact at issue, the involvement, it requires recusal on its face.

21. Indeed, the requested recusal in this EMERGENCY MOTION in the Petition for Writ of Certiorari case is made because of the vital importance associated with the issues at hand – the right to a fair and reliable trial and hearings under Due Process of Law, as well as ensuring that no federal judges are blackmailed or compromised in any cases such as a criminal case or Habeas Corpus 2255 civil case with significant implications if the blackmail allegations are not investigated, and video recordings to be reviewed by a Special Master to ensure no conflicts of interest and to ensure no ethics issues. It is respectfully submitted that Petitioner's duty to present all authorized claims of constitutional error with care and consider them with equal importance. Thus, it is key that Chief Justice John Roberts recuse himself and have no further involvement with any proceedings or any issues of Mr. Brian D. Hill's petition with the care demanded of such cases.

22. Petitioner had promised in his EMERGENCY APPLICATION (filed November 21, 2022) to file such a motion (such as this type of motion) to protect his Certiorari Petition case from any possible retaliation or retribution out of Chief Justice Robert's personal or financial interests over this matter. Therefore, this EMERGENCY MOTION hopefully is the appropriate vehicle. John Roberts was not the primary issue of the Petition for the Writ of

Certiorari and was not the primary issue of the Motion for Special Master and the Motion for Reconsideration, but to ensure that the federal judges in the U.S. District Court level are not being blackmailed by somebody in the United States Government and particularly the United States intelligence agencies. If they are blackmailed then they are constitutionally disqualified from participating in Brian David Hill's child pornography case and 2255 cases ever since the case first began in November 25, 2013. It would create a major constitutional dilemma if not a pure constitutional crisis requiring the entire case to be considered null and void on a large legal-scale. So, John Roberts is not the primary focus of the Petition for the Writ of Certiorari but his handling of the case would require that he not be involved in those proceedings at all. HE MUST RECUSE HIMSELF. Theoretically, he could retaliate or sabotage the Certiorari case or ask the Clerks to sabotage or block filings, anything illegal such as the clerk may just disappear filings and get away with it, or anything unethical could happen by not requiring this recusal for the sake of the best interests of justice. He must recuse himself, at all costs.

23. There was sabotage in three other cases before this Supreme court, because of the Clerk refusing to file documents and not even return them to Petitioner either requesting correction. See

cases no. 21-6036, 21-6037, 21-6038. Petitioner has a reason to suspect that if the Chief Justice was blackmailed, then he could have played a role with the clerk disappearing attempted emergency motion filings. Petitioner will try as hard as he can legally and lawfully to ensure that his current EMERGENCY MOTION is not going to be covered up by any deputy clerk like the cover ups of his emergency motions in cases no. 21-6036, 21-6037, 21-6038.

24. Therefore, in light of Petitioner's current obligations and the importance of the constitutional issues that will be presented in this case, Petitioner submit that this EMERGENCY MOTION is being filed to all honorable justices of this Court directed to compel recusal of Chief Justice Roberts is necessary and appropriate in order to effectively prosecute this Certiorari case and receive fair impartial treatment in the petition for writ of certiorari of Mr. Brian D. Hill's. Petitioner wants to be fair with John Roberts and give him another opportunity to voluntarily recuse himself.

25. Petitioner knows what it is like being falsely accused of a sex crime such as child pornography for example, then falsely pleads guilty for a crime he is innocent of, not allowed to review over all discovery materials prior to pleading guilty, then later finding out how fraudulent the child pornography prosecution truly was. Petitioner was not given a fair trial, not given due process. Petitioner suspects

he had been set up, then the set up got solidified as if Petitioner was now being blackmailed by and controlled by a set up which such fraud coerced a false guilty plea of an actually innocent man. Brian Hill knows what it is like being accused of a sex crime he is innocent of, as a virgin who has never had sex. Brian rather not bring the Lin Wood allegations of the facts presented in this APPLICATION to every single justice if he does not have to. Hopefully every honorable justice of this Court understands the significant legal importance of why this EMERGENCY MOTION should be granted or considered to recuse John Roberts and give him that chance to recuse himself for the interest of justice and impartiality. See family provided links: <https://wearechange.org/case-brian-d-hill/> and <https://www.activistpost.com/2019/06/can-of-worms-infowars-targeted-by-child-porn-and-msm-not-the-first-time-alternative-journalists-set-up.html> Petitioner understands that regardless of whether John Roberts is guilty or not guilty of Lin Wood's alleged claims, that John Roberts should have a right to quietly recuse himself from the foregoing Certiorari case. Petitioner only wants true justice and equity. He does not wish to ruffle up feathers and stir up hornets' nests if he does not have to. Petitioner only wants justice, due process, his guaranteed constitutional rights, and his liberty.

26. Nothing in this motion should be interpreted to disparage this high Court or suggest any impropriety whatsoever unless this evidence of impropriety is proven factual and beyond a reasonable doubt which those matters were brought up by a licensed attorney Lin Wood. The goal is to assure that Petitioner and the public can access a written record of this Court's compliance with 28 USC § 455, which is also a matter of procedural due process. The procedural due process of the U.S. Constitution requires that John Roberts recuse himself pursuant to 28 USC § 455, because of his name being accused by Attorney Lin Wood of doing things that are at reference of the same alleged blackmail scheme claims which accumulatively all come together like a jigsaw puzzle with a lot of potentially serious questions of both a criminal nature and of a nature of safeguarding due process of law of a petitioner in a Certiorari case or any case for request a Extraordinary Remedy.

27. With the utmost respect for this high Court and its honorable Justices, Petitioner respectfully moves for an openly published review of this Court's conflict of interest regarding only a single justice which such issue can easily be remedied by simply recusal of this single justice, and this issue of whether this justice is truly blackmailed or not can be left for another day for another case or for an investigation or anything outside of the scope of this case.

Petitioner simply wishes this Court to address this issue regarding any recusals/disqualifications as required by federal law and the U.S. Constitution's due process of law under the Fifth Amendment to ensure not only this Court's fair discussion in conference behind closed doors, but the appearance of same to those outside the doors.

**PRAYER TO GOD AND JESUS CHRIST FOR THIS COURT TO
BRING EQUITABLE RELIEF, PRAYER FOR ALL JUSTICES TO
CONSIDER THIS EMERGENCY MOTION BEFORE
CONSIDERATION OF THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF
CERTIORARI**

Wherefore, in the best interest of justice and for good cause shown, Petitioner Brian David Hill respectfully request that all justices of this Court consider this EMERGENCY MOTION to compel Chief Justice John Roberts of this Court to recuse himself from all proceedings in the Petition for Writ of Certiorari case, the foregoing case.

Wherefore, in the best interest of avoiding conflicts of interest whether perceived or actual conflicts of interest, Petitioner Brian David Hill respectfully requests from this Court from the honorable justices that Chief Justice John Roberts of this Court recuses himself from all proceedings in the Petition for Writ of Certiorari case, the foregoing case, pursuant to 28 USC § 455.

Wherefore, Petitioner requests any other relief that this Court finds to be appropriate or necessary to attain the ends of justice.

God Bless You all. Where We Go One We Go All.

DATED this 2nd day of December, 2022.



Respectfully submitted,

Brian D. Hill
Signed

Brian D. Hill

Brian David Hill
Pro Se Petitioner
Ally of Q and Atty Lin Wood
Former USWGO Alternative News Reporter
310 FOREST STREET, APARTMENT 2
MARTINSVILLE, VIRGINIA 24112
Tel.: (276) 790-3505
E-Mail: c/o Roberta Hill rbhill67@comcast.net
JusticeForUSWGO.wordpress.com
JusticeForUSWGO.NL

U.S.W.G.O.