

No.

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

**TAREK FARAG -- Petitioner,
V.
JOE BIDEN, ET AL -- Respondents.**

**ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO
THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR
THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT**

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

**TAREK FARAG, PRO SE
411 N WARWICK AVE,
WESTMONT, IL 60559
(630) 709 3965
tarekfarag@comcast.net**

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

This petition is **extremely important** and **urgent** that needs this **court's immediate intervention**, especially it is simple, small, and doesn't need much time to resolve. It challenges the wide spread false claims that "**Burning Fossil Fuel is Causing a Harmful Global Warming**".

Which petitioner proved its falsity with real science and numbers, and insists on calling it a "Hoax". However, the Court insists on calling it real without any proof whatsoever or disputing petitioner's facts. This Hoax misled and is misleading many Courts, and a huge number of people. Enforcing it resulted, and will result, in conflicting decisions by the Courts, legal battles to enforce it and others opposing it, serious damages to the public, and wasting trillions of dollars we don't have.

This Court should grant this petition urgently without weighing too much on the procedures or the technicalities, but mainly, as a matter of extreme importance and urgency to the entire world, the public, the economy, the future of this country, and the future of our justice system that is being destroyed by politicizing it.

Questions Presented:

- I. The Appellate Court erred in not reversing the District Court's ruling that Farag's motion for a declaratory relief is frivolous, and not reversing its declaration that the hoax is real.
- II. The Appellate Court erred in not granting the injunctive relief.
- III. The Appellate Court erred in not disqualifying HJ Daniel.
- IV. The Appellate Court erred in denying Farag's request to file electronically.

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING

Petitioner: (Plaintiff-Appellant) Tarek Farag, pro se.

Respondents: Joseph Biden, in his Official Capacity as the President; Kamala Harris, in her Official Capacity as the Vice President; Alejandro Mayorkas, in his Official Capacity as Secretary of Homeland Security; Merrick Garland, in his Official Capacity as US AG; Michael Regan, in his Official Capacity as EPA Administrator; Kwame Raoul, in his Official Capacity as IL Attorney General; J.B. Pritzker, in his Official Capacity as IL Governor; Dick Durbin, in his Official Capacity as IL Senator; Tammy Duckworth, in her Official Capacity as IL Senator; Sean Casten, in his Official Capacity as IL Congressman; Louis DeJoy, in his Official Capacity as the Postmaster General; Gil Quiniones, ComEd CEO; The United States of America; The Media Companies
Respondents: MSNBC; CNN; CBS; CNBC; NPR; Washington Post; NY Times; Facebook; and Other Unknown Respondents (Defendants),

LIST OF PROCEEDINGS IN DISTRICT AND APPELLATE COURTS

Farag v. Biden, et al., No. 1:24-cv-02728, U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois. Farag's Motion to Declare that the Claims That "Burning Fossil Fuel is Causing Global Warming" is a Hoax and to Enjoin the Defendants from Enforcing it [49a], filed 10/9/24. Denied 10/22/24 [47a]. Notice of Appeal filed 11/1/24 [46a].

Farag v. Biden, et al., No. 24-2998, Farag's notice of appeal to U.S. Courts of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, filed 11/1/24 [46a]. Farag's Petition for rehearing filed 11/29/24 [11a]. Motion for an Urgent Oral Argument to Settle the Hoax, filed 12/2/24 [8a]. Plaintiff-Appellant

Motions to Bring the Attention to Overlooked Evidence and to File Electronically were filed 12/6/24 [4a]. Order denying the previous motions and to prevent Farag from any further filing, filed 12/10/24 [3a]. Order denying Farag's petition for rehearing, filed 12/23/24 [2a]. Notice of Issuance of Mandate, filed 12/31/24 [1a].

Following are some cases that this petition could be related to them:

SCOTUS Docket No.: 24A105, 20-1530 West Virginia v. EPA (06/30/2022), 10-0174 American Electric Power Co. v. Connecticut, 564 U.S. 410 (2011), 05-1120 Massachusetts v. EPA, 549 U.S. 497 (2007).

IMPORTANT NOTE: On 3/25/25 Farag filed a motion to intervene in case # 1:25-cv-820 (Columbia District), consolidated with other 5 cases (1:25-cv-698), arguing the spending of \$27 billions for the global warming Hoax that the EPA Administrator contended that their allocation was **fraudulent and criminal**. Which are the same reasons Farag is urging this Court to grant this petition. However, the Judge denied the motion without disputing any of its facts, and indicated that she didn't even read it. These consolidated **6 cases**, are part of the many cases that were filed and will be filed to support the Hoax that **need this Court's intervention to stop the Hoax's fraud**.

* * * * *

ABBREVIATIONS USED

DisCt: Northern District Court of Illinois

7ApCt: Seventh Circuit Appellate Court

HJ: Honorable Judge

Hoax: The claims that Burning Fossil Fuel is Causing harmful Global Warming

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Questions Presented	i
Parties To The Proceeding	ii
List Of Proceedings In District And Appellate Courts	ii
Important Note	iii
Abbreviations Used	iii
Table Of Contents	iv
Table Of Contents Of Appendix	v
Petition For A Writ Of Certiorari	1
Opinions Below	1
Jurisdiction	1
Statutory Provisions Involved and References:	
28 U.S.C. § 455	1
28 U.S.C. § 1292(a)	2
28 U.S.C. § 2201(a)	2
Handbook: Practitioner’s Handbook For Appeals To The United States Court Of Appeals, For The Seventh Circuit, 2020 Edition	2
Statement Of The Case	3
Argument	6
I- The Appellate Court erred in not reversing the District Court’s ruling that Farag’s motion for a declaratory relief is frivolous, and not reversing its declaration that the Hoax is real	9
II- The Appellate Court erred in not granting the injunctive relief	11
III- The Appellate Court erred in not disqualifying HJ Daniel	12

IV- The Appellate Court erred in denying Farag's requests to file electronically	13
Additional Reasons To Grant The Writ	13
Conclusion	15

TABLE OF CONTENTS OF APPENDIX

Notice of Issuance of Mandate [7th Circuit Appellate Court (24-2998)]	1a
Order Denying Petition for Rehearing [7th Circuit Appellate Court (24-2998)]	2a
Order Denying Oral Argument, and to Bring Attention to Overlooked Evidence, and to Stop Petitioner from Filing Any Further Filings [7th Circuit Appellate Court (24-2998)]	3a
Plaintiff-Appellant Motion to Bring the Attention to an Overlooked Evidence and to File Electronically [7th Circuit Appellate Court (24-2998)]	4a
Motion for an Urgent Oral Argument to Settle the Hoax [7th Circuit Appellate Court (24-2998)]	7a
Motion to Reconsider (Rehearing) the Order Denying Farag's Request to File Electronically and Summarily Affirming District Court's Denial of Farag's Motion for a Declaratory and Injunctive Relief [7th Circuit Appellate Court (24-2998)]	11a
Order Summarily Affirming the District Court's Denial of Farag's Motion for a Preliminary Injunction and His Motion to File Electronically [7th Circuit Appellate Court (24-2998)]	25a
Order Denying Farag's Motion for Extension of Time [District Court (1:24-cv-2728)]	27a
Plaintiff's Motion to Allow More Time to Respond (Because of the Appeal) [District Court (1:24-cv-	28a

2728)]	
Order Denying Farag’s Motion to Stay the Proceedings, and Certifying the Appeal as Frivolous	31a
Plaintiff’s Motion to Stay the Proceedings (Because of the Appeal) [District Court (1:24-cv-2728)]	33a
Transcript of Proceedings 10/22/24 at 9:57 AM [District Court (1:24-cv-2728)]	35a
Docketing Statement in the Hoax [7th Circuit Appellate Court (24-2998)]	44a
Notice of Appeal [District Court (1:24	46a
Order Denying the “Motion to Declare that the Claims That ‘Burning Fossil Fuel is Causing Global Warming’ is a Hoax and to Enjoin the Defendants from Enforcing It, Declaring that the Hoax is real, and Warning the Plaintiff from Filing Frivolous Filings [District Court (1:24	47a
Order Setting the Video Conferencing Hearing [District Court (1:24	48a
Motion to Declare that the Claims That ‘Burning Fossil Fuel is Causing Global Warming’ is a Hoax, and to Enjoin the Defendants from Enforcing It District Court (1:24	49a
Verified Amended Complaint For Declaratory, Injunctive, and Other Relief (Corrected) [District Court (1:24	56a
Order Denying Plaintiff’s Motions Asking the Court to Recuse Itself, and Seeking Reassignment [District Court (1:24	103a
Plaintiff’s Motion to Transfer the Case to H.J. Valderrama [District Court (1:24-cv-2728)]	104a

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner Tarek Farag (Farag) asks this Court for a writ of certiorari to review the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit (7ApCt) in this case.

OPINIONS BELOW

On 11/21/24, 7ApCt denied Farag's motion to file electronically, and affirmed the denial of the District Court to Farag's motion for Injunctive Relief (**only**) [25a, 26a]. Farag filed a Petition for Rehearing on 11/29/24 [11a-24a], a motion for an Urgent Oral Argument to Settle the Hoax on 12/1/24 [8a - 10a], and a motion to Bring the Attention to an Overlooked Evidence and to File Electronically on 12/6/24 [4a-7a]. On 12/10/24, 7ApCt denied the last two motions, advised Farag that any further filing will be returned, and kept the Petition for Rehearing under consideration [3a]. 7ApCt denied Farag's Petition for Rehearing on 12/31/24 [2a], and issued its NOTICE OF ISSUANCE OF MANDATE on 12/31/24 [1a].

JURISDICTION

On 11/21/24, 7ApCt denied Farag's motion to file electronically, and summarily **AFFIRMED** the DisCt's denial of Farag's motion for a preliminary injunction [25a, 21a]. 7ApCt denied Farag's Petition for Rehearing on 12/29/24 [2a], and issued its NOTICE OF ISSUANCE OF MANDATE on 12/31/24 [1a]. The Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §1651(a) §1254(1).

STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

28 U.S.C. § 455: Disqualification of justice, judge, or magistrate judge

(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.

(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;

28 U.S.C. § 1292(a): Except as provided in subsections (c) and (d) of this section, the courts of appeals shall have jurisdiction of appeals from:

(1) Interlocutory orders of the district courts of the United States, the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone, the District Court of Guam, and the District Court of the Virgin Islands, or of the judges thereof, granting, continuing, modifying, refusing or dissolving injunctions, or refusing to dissolve or modify injunctions, except where a direct review may be had in the Supreme Court.

28 U.S.C. § 2201(a): In a case of actual controversy within its jurisdiction, - - -, any court of the United States, upon the filing of an appropriate pleading, may declare the rights and other legal relations of any interested party seeking such declaration, whether or not further relief is or could be sought. Any such declaration shall have the force and effect of a final judgment or decree and shall be reviewable as such.

REFERENCES:

Handbook (Practitioner's Handbook For Appeals To The United States Court Of Appeals, For The Seventh Circuit, 2020 Edition). Section VI.E.6(a) Interlocutory Appeals:

(pg 56) In summary, “mandatory interlocutory orders are considered injunctions reviewable under § 1292(a)(1) only if they effectively grant or withhold the relief sought on the merits and affect one party’s ability to obtain such relief in a way that cannot be rectified by a later appeal (that is, ‘irreparably’). Stated differently, [a]n order...is properly characterized as an injunction when it substantially and obviously alters the parties’ preexisting legal relationship.” *Jamie S. v. Milwaukee Public Schools*, 668 F.3d 481, 490 (7th Cir. 2012) (internal quotations marks and citations omitted).

(pg 58) (f) *Review of Other Nonfinal Rulings*. In addition, other nonappealable orders may be reviewed along with the order granting or denying an injunction if they are closely related and considering them together is more economical than postponing consideration to a later appeal, or if the appealable order turns on the validity of the other non-final orders. *Resolution Trust Corp. v. Ruggiero*, 994 F.2d 1221, 1225 (7th Cir. 1993); *Artist M. v. Johnson*, 917 F.2d 980, 986 (7th Cir. 1990), *rev’d on other grounds sub nom., Suter v. Artist M.*, 503 U.S. 347 (1992); *Elliott v. Hinds*, 786 F.2d 298, 301 (7th Cir. 1986); *Parks v. Pavkovic*, 753 F.2d 1397, 1402 (7th Cir. 1985). See also this Handbook, *infra* at 66-68.

* * * * *

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Farag filed his original complaint (jury trial) on 4/4/24 that was assigned to HJ Daniel. On 5/28/24, he filed a motion “To Transfer the Case to H.J. Valderrama”, expressing his concern that HJ Daniel could be in a difficult position to be neutral [104a, 105a], because the defendant Joe Biden assigned him to the bench and the defendants Dick Durbin and Tammy Duckworth recommended him. HJ Daniel denied it on 5/30/24, stating “*To the extent the plaintiff asks this Court to recuse itself*”

from this case, the Court sees no conflict concerning the parties or subject matter" [103a]. Farag filed his Verified Amended Complaint on 9/18/24, for "**Declaratory, Injunctive, and Other Relief**" [56a - 102a]. Pursuant to **28 U.S.C. § 2201(a)**, Farag filed his verified "Motion to **Declare** that the Claims that "**Burning Fossil Fuel is Causing Global Warming**" is a hoax (hereinafter **Hoax**), and to enjoin the defendants from enforcing it [49a - 55a]. Farag proved his standing by providing evidence that he is having continuous and actual damages due to enforcing the Hoax. Some of which is paying extra \$16 on one of his monthly electric bill directly to enforce the Hoax (Carbon-Free Energy, Zero Emission, Renewable Portfolio, etc.) [49a ¶4, 80a ¶49, 102a]. Farag explained the invalidity of the Hoax and its fraud by numbers. He proved that doubling CO2 concentration would reduce the distance to absorb CO2 to half, **NOT increase the amount of IR absorbed, as the Hoax claims** [50a ¶3]. Farag alleged and proved that the Hoax is a hoax using the reports of NASA and IPCC (United Nations' **Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change**), which are considered the international authorities on climate change that all the proponents of the Hoax rely on. IPCC admitted that increasing greenhouse gases will cause global cooling not warming [65a ¶20, 69a ¶25], then contradicted it by a misleading and non-scientific statement that changes in clouds will amplify global warming in the future [51a ¶5, 93a ¶2]. NASA and IPCC stated fraudulent statements that Earth's surface receives 160 W/m² of the Sun's energy and emits larger energy of 398 W/m² [65a ¶21, 93a, 64a Fig 1, 66a Fig2]. NASA and IPCC fabricated the measurements to falsely validate their models [53a, 67a]. Further, Farag supported his proof of the Hoax by the testimony of two professors before Congress, showing that

there is no scientific basis for climate-related risk caused by fossil fuels and CO2, and there is no climate emergency [54a ¶9, 70a ¶27]. No response, objection to Farag's standing, or dispute to any of his facts or allegations was raised or entered in the record. On 10/22/24, HJ Daniel **denied** Farag's motion for declaratory and injunctive relief. On 11/1/24, Farag filed his Notice of Appeal for denying his motions and the decisions relating to them [46a]. On 11/8/24, Farag filed the Docketing Statement. The general issues to be raised were that his verified motion should have been granted, as there are no disputes to its facts, all the defendants were served and had more than enough time to oppose without anyone opposing it, there is nothing in the record that supports the denial, and there is an appearance of Judge's partiality [44a]. On 11/19/24, Farag filed a motion to stay the proceeding [33a]. Farag stated that HJ Daniel ruling puts the entire case in jeopardy, and cause severe irreparable harms, and Farag is expeditiously and diligently appealing that ruling, and is working very hard, under tremendous pressure, to file his appellant's brief [34a]. On 11/20/24, HJ Daniel reiterated his denial of Farag's motion for injunctive relief only, certified the appeal as frivolous, and declined to stay the case pending appeal [34a]. On the next day, 11/21/24, 7ApCt **summarily affirmed** DisCt's denial of Farag's motion for a **preliminary injunction ONLY**, stating that *"This court has carefully reviewed the record in the district court, the record on appeal, and Farag's motion"* [26a]. On 11/29/24, Farag filed in 7ApCt a motion to reconsider (rehearing) the order denying his request to file electronically and summarily affirming DisCt's denial of his motion for a declaratory and injunctive relief" [13a – 24a]. Farag pointed to 7ApCt's errors: didn't rule on the declaratory relief nor Judge's disqualification, not

considering the evidence on the record, not specifying the basis for its summarily decision, and not reversing HJ Daniel's ruling that Farag's motion is frivolous, and the Hoax is real. Farag pointed more to the dangers of promoting the Hoax and simplified the scientific explanation against the Hoax so that a six-year-old can understand. On 12/1/2024, Farag filed a motion for an urgent oral argument to settle the Hoax [8a - 10a]. He expressed his belief that once the proponents of the Hoax define some terms and answer few questions he will be able to prove that the Hoax is a hoax within few minutes [11a]. On 12/6/24, Farag filed in DisCt a motion to allow more time to respond to some defendants. He iterated that the EPA stated clearly that it has no scientific proof whatsoever to support the Hoax, and that the declaratory judgment can help resolve uncertainty about legal obligations or rights before a lawsuit is fully developed, hence the Court should halt the development of the case [28a, 30a]. On 12/9/24, HJ Daniel denied that motion [27a]. On 12/6/24, Farag filed in 7ApCt a motion to file electronically, and to bring the attention to the fact that the EPA has no scientific proof whatsoever to support the Hoax [4a – 7a, 83a ¶63]. On 12/10/24, the 7ApCt denied Farag's motions for oral argument and to bring the attention to overlooked evidence, and ordered him not to do any further filings [3a]. On 12/31/24, 7ApCt filed its 2.3-line order denying Farag's motion for rehearing [1a].

ARGUMENT

- 1- Farag is presenting a summary of the argument; however, the details are in the full record.
- 2- The main issues of the appeal to 7ApCt were to declare that the Hoax is a hoax, disqualify the Judge for a potential

bias, and enjoining the enforcement of the Hoax. The injunction can't be obtained without the declaration, and the declaration couldn't be obtained from a biased Judge. All these issues are "*closely related and considering them together is more economical than postponing consideration to a later appeal*", and they all "*are considered injunctions reviewable under §1292(a)(1)*" [see citation: Hndbook pages 56, 58 stated before].

3- Farag believes and argues that behind the Hoax is an International Criminal Enterprise [96a]

4- Farag is disputing the Hoax by exposing the fraud of IPCC, NASA, and others, besides providing logical scientific proofs that are 100% certain. As Einstein said, "*If you can't explain it to a six-year-old, you don't understand it yourself*", and as Galileo said, "*In questions of science, the authority of a thousand is not worth the humble reasoning of a single individual*", Farag is doing exactly that. In addition, he is presenting the findings of other honest scientists [54a ¶9].

5- In this case HJ Daniel is in a difficult position to be neutral in spite of certifying that he "*sees no conflict concerning the parties or subject matter*" [103a], which proved to be untrue. He has connections to the most powerful defendants, facing solid facts that contradict his belief as to the "subject matter", and is ruling contrary to the long settled rules of "accepting the sworn alleged facts as true and viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the non-moving party", even he couldn't see "*any evidence whatsoever to support your statement that there is no scientific basis, or that issues of manmade global warming, as you frame it, are a hoax*" [41a]. Further, HJ Daniel certified his faulty ruling as to the injunction only to 7ApCt to push it to reject the appeal. As a result, 7ApCt summarily affirmed the denial of the

injunctive relief ONLY within 24 hours [21a]. Farag filed a petition for rehearing and other pleadings to draw their attentions to the facts and the evidence, already in the record, that they claimed that they “*carefully reviewed*” [26a], but they missed. However, all the Judges denied the petition for rehearing in about 2.3-lines without stating any reason [2a].

6- After 7ApCt denied Farag’s motion for rehearing on 12/31/2024, he immediately started working on this petition. He devoted all his time to finish it thinking that he could prepare it within few days, but he couldn’t finish it except on 2/17/25. To avoid sanctions, Farag couldn’t file responses to the defendants affirming his belief that the Hoax is a hoax, or a motion to amend the complaint. On 2/5/25, HJ Daniel dismissed the case without prejudice (apparently not to allow Farag to appeal), he stated:

“And because the Court dismisses this case for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction, this dismissal is without prejudice. See Citadel Securities, LLC v. Chi. Bd. Options Exchange, Inc., 808 F.3d 694 (7th Cir. 2015) (“A dismissal for lack of subject matter jurisdiction is not a decision on the merits, and thus cannot be a dismissal with prejudice.”).

It should be noted that HJ Daniel’s declaration that the Hoax is real and ruling that Farag’s motion to declare that the Hoax is a hoax, are rulings on the merits that he didn’t reverse, making them appealable. HJ Daniel stated an inaccurate statements as if 7ApCt affirmed that the Hoax is not a hoax, while it affirmed denying the injunction only [26a]:

“The Court first addresses standing as to Counts I, II, IV, and V because they can be analyzed summarily. Count I’s request for declaratory relief

that “claims that burning fossil fuel is causing global warming has no scientific basis and is a Hoax” parrots a motion Farag previously filed (R. 40), and the Court has already ruled on. (R. 63; R. 80; see also R. 104 (*summary disposition affirming district court order by the Seventh Circuit*).) The complaint does not present “any evidence whatsoever to support” Farag’s claims about global warming or demonstrate that he has standing; it is “frivolous and misleading.” (R. 80 at 9:3–13.) Count I is therefore dismissed as to all defendants.”

I- The Appellate Court erred in not reversing the District Court’s ruling that Farag’s motion for a declaratory relief is frivolous, and not reversing its declaration that the Hoax is real

7- Summarily affirming DisCt order [26a] is a fatal error, based on the fatal error of HJ Daniel’s order [47a] that has nothing whatsoever in the record to support it, or to dispute any of Farag’s sworn facts against the Hoax. This sets a dangerous precedence and makes a mockery of the appealing process.

8- The most important goal of this case is to **declare** that the Hoax is a hoax, without it the entire case will collapse. HJ Daniel ordered that Farag’s motion for the declaratory relief is frivolous, and threatened him with severe sanctions, making it impossible for Farag to proceed in the case, which made the order an INJUNCTION reviewable under § 1292(a)(1) [see Handbook pg 56, 58]. Farag couldn’t find out how or why HJ Daniel and the Judges of 7ApCt determined that “*plaintiff has not presented any evidence to support his motion and has not identified any authority that would allow the Court to grant the plaintiff the relief he seeks*” [47a]. Farag stated 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a)

as the authority according to which HJ Daniel is allowed to grant the declaratory relief [49a ¶1]. If filing motions supported by undisputed facts and numbers is frivolous and misleading, what else is not?

9- Not to repeat the evidence supporting the declaratory relief, Farag is simplifying and summarizing some here so that a six-year-old can understand that the Hoax is a hoax.

10- The EPA has no scientific proof whatsoever to support the Hoax, proving it to be a hoax [4a ¶1].

11- Increasing CO₂ in the atmosphere will result in absorbing the IR radiated from the earth in a shorter distance, not increase the amount of energy radiated/absorbed, especially if we assume that CO₂ is a strong absorber (not accurate). This is similar to the visible distance when driving at night with little fog using car light, when the fog increases the visible distance will decrease, not the energy of the car light increases [46a].

12- One molecule of water vapor absorbs IR energy much more than one molecule of CO₂ [50a]. For each CO₂ molecule there are about 2500 molecules of other gasses, including water that could be about 1000. If you have 1000 gm of sugar with 1 gm of salt, is adding additional 1 gm of salt can change the taste? Similarly, doubling CO₂ would have negligible effect [50a].

13- NASA and IPCC are lying when they say that the Earth's surface receives about 160 W/m², but emits about 400 W/m². Can I give you every morning \$160 and you give me every night \$400?

14- When I give you \$159 and tell you that they are \$160, you count them many times with high accuracy to find them \$159, would you believe that I gave you \$160, or you consider that I'm cheating? This is what NASA and IPCC are doing, adjusting the measurements to agree with

their faulty models [51a - 53a]. Additionally, if I tell you that millions and millions of experts, scientists, TV stations, news sources, lawyers, judges, etc. counted them and certified that the money is \$160, and we accuse you of lying, would you agree with us or you become certain that we are - - - ?

15- Instead of declaring the Hoax to be a hoax, HJ Daniel made an opposite declaration (without any party's request) that the Hoax is real: "I think it is fairly well-settled that climate change is a thing, and it is happening". He didn't point to anything in the record or presented any evidence whatsoever to support his statement [37a]. Farag disputed his declaration and findings, and pointed to the failure of 7ApCt to recognize this error and reverse it. Further, HJ Daniel didn't identify any authority that would allow him to make that declaration (as he asked Farag).

16- Farag is re-emphasizing the great importance and urgency to declare that the Hoax is a hoax. Because: 1) It affects the past and future ruling of SCOTUS, as Farag demonstrated how the promoters of the Hoax misled some of its Justices [16a ¶10]; 2) It is very urgent to stop the egregious and illogical actions like capturing CO₂, or spreading reflectors in the atmosphere to prevent sun's energy from reaching the earth; 3) To stop destroying our economy; and 4) To stop the huge waste of about \$2 millions/hour of our money [18a ¶14].

17- For the above reasons alone Farag's petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

II- The Appellate Court erred in not granting the injunctive relief.

18- HJ Daniel made the 7ApCt think that Farag's appeal is directed only to the injunctive relief, by stating "The plaintiff appealed the Court's denial of the plaintiff's

motion for injunctive relief". He further directed 7ApCt to affirm his denial by giving the impression that he is "moving forward on the merits, developing the complete record, and resolving whether the plaintiff has, in fact, met his burden", and eliminated any possibility for 7ApCt to examine the appeal, by certifying the appeal as frivolous [32a]. Additionally, HJ Daniel has already made his own declaration that the Hoax is real and Farag's allegations are frivolous, leaving nothing to 7ApCt to decide. As a result, within 24 hours the 7ApCt affirmed his denial of the injunction, stating that "This court has carefully reviewed the record" [20a], which Farag believes it to be untrue or a fatal error. Because there is no opposition in the record, if they read the notice of appeal and the docketing statement they could have noticed the three issues raised (especially declaratory relief), and words like Hoax, suffer, waste, fabricate, "International Criminal Enterprise", etc. however, they didn't even mention any of them.

19- 7ApCt stated that "*the district court's denial of Farag's motion for a preliminary injunction is summarily AFFIRMED*" [21a], which is in a clear violation of the well established rules to accept the alleged facts as true and viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the non-moving party. Who is moving for this summary ruling? Is it the Judge? Where are the opposing pleadings? What are the facts 7ApCt relied on? What are Farag's facts found to be untrue?

20- Farag filed a petition for rehearing and other documents to convince 7ApCt to correct its ruling. However, its judges denied the petition without stating anything whatsoever to justify their decision [2a], which is a fatal error, and the injunction should have been granted.

21- Just alleging that the government is wasting \$2,000,000 per hour, should have made DisCt and 7ApCt order a TRO on their own initiatives, which is another reason to grant the petition.

III- The Appellate Court erred in not disqualifying HJ Daniel

22- On 5/28/24, Farag noticed that HJ Daniel should recuse himself due to the potential of bias towards the defendants: President Biden (appointed him), and Senators Durbin and Duckworth (recommended him). He filed a motion for that [104a – 105a], which was denied on 5/30/24 [103a].

23- Farag's concerns about the potential of HJ Daniel's bias were confirmed when he, not only, denied Farag's motion for declaratory and injunctive relief, but also, declaring that the Hoax is real, and worse, ruling that the motion is frivolous and misleading [47a, 37a], and further, certifying his biased ruling to the 7ApCt. to deny Farag's appeal (as happened) [32a, 26a].

24- HJ Daniel rulings were based on his own knowledge in violation of U.S.C. § 455 [12a], which disqualified him. Additionally, nothing in the record supports his rulings, he ignored all the undisputed facts presented by Farag, and none of the defendants opposed Farag's motion.

25- For the above, the 7ApCt should have disqualified HJ Daniel, and this Court should grant the petition for a writ of certiorari.

IV- The Appellate Court erred in denying Farag's requests to file electronically

26- Farag repeated requests to file electronically in 7ApCt were all denied without any reason [3a, 25a]. This is in spite of the Court's mandates to file electronically,

Farag was filing electronically in DisCt, and was receiving all the documents filed in 7ApCt electronically. This showed a bias against Farag by 7ApCt, which should be a reason to grant this petition.

ADDITIONAL REASONS TO GRANT THE WRIT

27- There are currently fights about the Hoax including electric cars' manufacturers, oil and gas companies, some states, etc. that this Court needs to end them with the requested declaration.

28- Our legal system is in a disastrous situation and the people lost trust in all levels of our Courts. The poisonous political environment is destroying our Courts.

29- The Constitution divided the Government into three branches: Legislative, Executive, and Judicial. The recent technological developments added the Media branch, news and social, as a forth branch stronger than the three together, creating a huge imbalance and extremely dangerous situation. Just recently it was proved that the media was getting money from the government to spread its lies proving Farag's allegation of their conspiracy, which is the main issue in his case, and they must be held accountable for their lies, it is not a freedom of speech.

30- Unfortunately, we have a legal system not a justice system, in which the Courts swap their goals with their tools. Instead of making their goals achieving justice using the legal procedures as tools, they made their goals to strictly follow the legal procedure and made achieving justice their tool to justify following strictly the procedures. The measure of the strength of a legal system is its ability to achieve justice to the layperson (pro se), the poor, and the weak, not the rich or the best lawyers. In our system, it is almost impossible for a pro se to succeed in


getting justice. Farag hopes that this Court would grant his petition to achieve justice.

31- Due to the prohibition of the recordings of the Court proceedings, Farag had problems participating in the hearing [15a ¶9]. With the evolution of the technologies of the audio and video recordings, including the ability to convert the speech into text instantly, the Courts, at all levels, should generally allow the parties to do their own recordings and when there are disputes, the official Court recording could be used to resolve them. Allowing the recordings would reduce the cost of litigation, allow the public to be aware about the issues, and watch the judges.

CONCLUSION

This Court should grant the petition for a writ of certiorari, and other relief as appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,



Petitioner: TAREK FARAG, pro se
411 N WARWICK AVE, WESTMONT, IL 60559
(630) 709 3965
tarekfarag@comcast.net

TABLE OF CONTENTS OF APPENDIX

Notice of Issuance of Mandate [7th Circuit Appellate Court (24-2998)]	1a
Order Denying Petition for Rehearing [7th Circuit Appellate Court (24-2998)]	2a
Order Denying Oral Argument, and to Bring Attention to Overlooked Evidence, and to Stop Petitioner from Filing Any Further Filings [7th Circuit Appellate Court (24-2998)]	3a
Plaintiff-Appellant Motion to Bring the Attention to an Overlooked Evidence and to File Electronically [7th Circuit Appellate Court (24-2998)]	4a
Motion for an Urgent Oral Argument to Settle the Hoax [7th Circuit Appellate Court (24-2998)]	7a
Motion to Reconsider (Rehearing) the Order Denying Farag's Request to File Electronically and Summarily Affirming District Court's Denial of Farag's Motion for a Declaratory and Injunctive Relief [7th Circuit Appellate Court (24-2998)]	11a
Order Summarily Affirming the District Court's Denial of Farag's Motion for a Preliminary Injunction and His Motion to File Electronically [7th Circuit Appellate Court (24-2998)]	25a
Order Denying Farag's Motion for Extension of Time [District Court (1:24-cv-2728)]	27a
Plaintiff's Motion to Allow More Time to Respond (Because of the Appeal) [District Court (1:24-cv-2728)]	28a
Order Denying Farag's Motion to Stay the Proceedings, and Certifying the Appeal as Frivolous	31a