


24-7006 ORIGINAL

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES



OWEN MARLON ALEXANDER

Petitioner

Vs.

ANDREEA GLEESON "et-al"

Respondent(s)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

&

THE U. S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK,

(BROOKLYN)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

OWEN MARLON ALEXANDER



Pro Se Litigant

P.O. Box 1049

New York, N.Y. 10163

Owenalexander47@outlook.com

1-347-785-7015



QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

1. Are State and Federal Judges above the law?
2. Is Deputy Chief Administrative Judge (DCAJ) Deborah Kaplan of the New York County Supreme Court Civil Team above the law?
3. If DCAJ's, Deborah Kaplan of the New York County Supreme Court Civil Team is not above the law, may the petitioner file a lawsuit against her?
4. When the petitioner requested to proceed Informa pauperis, in pursuant to 28 U.S.C.-1915, in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York, (Brooklyn), the request was dismissed for failure to comply with rule 8 (a) of the Federal Rules of civil procedures, the petitioner was granted leave to file an amended complaint. Which list of respondents / defendants is valid, the original list of defendants, the amended list of defendants, or both, the original and the amended list of respondents / defendants are valid?
5. Why was magistrate Judge Ramon E. Reyes, Jr., assigned to all three (3) complaints the petitioner filed to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District Court, (Brooklyn)?
6. Is Camille Reyes related to magistrate judge Ramon Reyes, Jr., of the District Court for the Eastern District of New York, Brooklyn, in any way?
7. Are any of the judges that presided in any of the complaints the petitioner submitted to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District, (Brooklyn),

and to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, are members of the Roman Catholic Church community?

8. Was anyone in the administrative department of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District clerk's office, or the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit clerk's office, or any administrative judicial officer of the court, who took part of the administrative practices and procedures of the petitioner complaints to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District, (Brooklyn), and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, a member of the Roman Catholic church community?
9. Is Archbishop Christophe Pierre above the law?
10. Because Archbishop Christophe Pierre is a religious leader who is a member of the Roman Catholic Church, which have over 2.8 million members in their community in New York City alone, does that make Archbishop Pierre above the law?
11. Why was the petitioner approached by a clergy member of the Roman Catholic church before entering the Coney Island hospital?
12. What is spiritual warfare, is it real, and how did the petitioner become a part of spiritual warfare?
13. What is soul harvesting, is it real, and why is the petitioner soul being harvest?
14. What is destiny swapping, and can the petitioner's destiny be swapped?

//
CA

15. Does having written material in the library of congress make the petitioner a threat to society?
16. Is playing the petitioner's guitar at specific healing frequencies a threat to society?
17. Why is the petition's guitar is considered a weapon?
18. Why was 342Hz, 417Hz, 444Hz, and other healing frequencies band from music creators?
19. Why was the petitioner music shadow band by TuneCore Inc.?
20. Is the respondent Andreea Gleeson related to U.S. District Court Judge John Gleeson of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York, (Brooklyn), in any way?
21. Does the petitioner have any Civil Rights as a Nationalized citizen?
22. As a nationalized citizen of the United States, does the petitioner have any constitutional rights, and if yes, why are the petitioner constitutional rights being violated by State, Federal judges, government officials, clergy members of the Roman Catholic Church community, and other religious groups, gang members, family members, DHS, and by Acacia Network administrative staff members?
23. Does the petitioner have any rights as a human being?
24. Why the petitioner is being emotionally and spiritually abused by State, Federal Judges of the judicial system, government officials, the Roman

///
CH

Catholic clergy, and other religious groups, NYCDHS, Super 8 Acacia Networks administrative staff members, and family members?

25. Why are MK-Ultra tactics, and other unethical tactics being used against the petitioner?
26. Because the petitioner was abused by the petitioner's mother and was forced to read specific scriptures from the bible, does that mean that the petitioner has a mental health issue?
27. The petitioner has been residing at the DHS Super 8 Acacia Network shelter for over two (2) years with no assistance from Acacia Network administrative case managers, will the petitioner spend the rest of his life at the Super 8 DHS Acacia Network shelter?
28. Are the DHS Super 8 Acacia Network administrative workers, and operations staff above the law?
29. Does Acacia Network, or any individual, or entity have guardianship or power of attorney over the petitioner, and if they do, who authorized it, and why?
30. The fact that Acacia Network also own and operates mental health facilities, does that mean that the DHS Super 8 shelter where the petitioner currently reside at is a mental health facility for homeless men?
31. Why was the building Director Davidson Headley terminated from the Hegeman Avenue Housing Limited partnership/ Breaking Ground management team?

1/1
OK

32. If the building director, Mr. Headley, was terminated before the housing hold-over court trial date, how was the housing hold-over case #LT-073269-19/KI valid?
33. Constitutional law gives the petitioner the right to an attorney at a trial in any court of law proceedings; however, the petitioner was not represented by an attorney at the Brooklyn Housing Court case #LT-073269-19/KI trial and was denied an attorney from the Legal Aid Society. Why was the petitioner denied legal representation at the Brooklyn Housing Court case trial?
34. Why was the housing hold-over case # LT-073269-19/KI, adjourned over five (5) times, and rescheduled over seven (7) times in favor of the Hegeman Avenue Housing Limited Partnership, Breaking Ground?
35. Who was the petitioner previous landlord, the Hegeman Avenue Housing Limited partnership, or Breaking Ground?
36. If the Hegeman Avenue Housing Partnership was the petitioner landlord, who was Breaking Ground?
37. Why did Breaking Ground notify the petitioner of Mr. Headly termination if the Hegeman Avenue Housing Partnership was the petitioner landlord?
38. The petitioner had an Emergency Rental Assistance Program, (ERAP) application on file pending review. Under the ERAP program, it was unlawful to evict the petitioner with an ERAP application pending review.

V
91

Why was the petitioner evicted when the petitioner had an ERAP application pending review and the premises were in a non-eviction zone?

(Area Code 11212).

39. Is the Center for Urban Community Services (CUCS) funded by the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA)?

40. Why were CUCS employed by Breaking Ground to manipulate and harass their tenants?

1/1
OK

LIST OF PARTIES

[] All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.

[x] All parties **do not** appear in the caption of the case on the cover page. A list of all parties to the proceedings in the court whose judgement is the subject of this petition is as follows:

TUNECORE INC, DR. PHILLIP NICHOLS, FACEBOOK, INSTAGRAM, WHATS APP, YOUTUBE, DEVON ROACH, PADLOCK RECORDS, ARIEL VARGAS, THE OFFICE OF THE OMBUDSMAN, MOLLY WASOW PARKS, THE CITY OF NEW YORK & THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELESS SERVICES, LYMARIS ALBORS, JASMILKA GONZALEZ, ASHELY MARRERO, HANNOND JOHN, RENAIYA THOMAS, CLARA GARCIA, ACACIA NETWORK/SUPER 8, BRENDA E. ROSEN, THOMAS WASHINGTON, AARON R. McBRYAR, ANA FISHER, DAVE BEER, FELICESADE BRANT, DAVIDSON HEADLEY, BREAKING GROUND/HEGEMAN AVENUE HOUSING LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, KEISHA ASHMAN, ROY A. BECOAT, JETTE JOHNSON, LUNA MALACHOWSKI BAJAK, ALYSSA WRINKLE, MARINA MULE, KRYSTLE BARKLEY, JOSHUA FLINK, SAMUEL BARTON, CAMILLE REYES, CENTER FOR URBAN COMMUNITY SERVICES (CUCS), PHILLIP SCHREIBER, KELLNER, HERLIHY, GETTY & FRIEDMAN, LLP, P.O. ANGEL RODRIGUEZ, CITY OF NEW YORK POLICE DEPARTMENT/73 PRECIENT, DR. MARTIN BRENNAN, DR. ROBERT GREEN, LYNN VAIRO, ROBERT O. STRANDER, NATASHA PAYSON, KAREN

MORALES, PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT SERVICES INC., CHRISTOPHER
WRAY, Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), MICHAEL WEISBERG, CHERY J.
GONZALES, DEBORAH KAPLAN, BRIAN M. COGAN, NEW YORK CITY & THE
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, MONIQUE GUIDRY, KATHY HOCHUL,
ARCHBISHOP CHRISTOPHE PIERRE, APOTOLIC NUNCIO & THE ROMAN
CATHOLIC CHURCH, MERLYN CECILIA ALEXANDER, MEHBOOB AHMED.

RELATED CASES

Alexander V. Program Development Services Inc.

Case No. 18-cv-01433-BMC-RER

U.S. District Court for the Eastern District, (Brooklyn)

Judgment entered: June 8th, 2019.

Hegeman Avenue Housing Limited Partnership V. Alexander

Case No. 73269/19KI

Civil Court of the City of New York County of Kings: Housing Part

Judgment entered: January 14th, 2020.

Judgment entered: June 23rd, 2022; Motion seq.no.4

Owen Marlon Alexander V. Breaking Ground/CUCS/the Hegeman.

Brooklyn Housing Court; Papirman B.C., Caseworker Adult

Protective Services; & the Alexander Family,

Case No. 20-cv-5114-BMC-RER

Judgment entered: November 2nd, 2020.

Judgment entered: November 3rd, 2020.

ix
OR

Owen Marlon Alexander V. Breaking Ground, et al.,

Case No. 20-3932

Judgement entered: March 24th, 2021.

Judgement entered: MANDATE ISSUED ON April 30th, 2021.

L
OA

TABLE OF CONTENT

	Pages
Opinions Below	1.
Jurisdiction	11 of Appendix A.
Jurisdiction	82 – 100 of Appendix H.
Constitutional & Statutory Provision Involved	463 -490 of Appendix R.
Constitutional & Statutory Provision Involved	491 – 696 of Appendix S.
Constitutional & Statutory provision Involved	697 – 700 of Appendix T.
Statement of the Case	6 – 14.
Reason for Granting the Writ	14 – 19.
Conclusion	20 – 24.

INDEX OF APPENDICES

Appendix A	1 – 11.
Appendix B	12 – 23.
Appendix C	24 – 25.
Appendix D	26 – 33.
Appendix E	34 – 38.

Li
OA

Appendix F	39 – 50.
Appendix G	51 – 81.
Appendix H	82 – 100.
Appendix I	101 – 106.
Appendix J	107 – 263.
Appendix K	264 – 271.
Appendix L	271 – 282.
Appendix M	283 – 306.
Appendix N	307 – 316.
Appendix O	317 – 398.
Appendix P	399 – 401.
Appendix Q	402 – 462.
Appendix R	463 – 490.
Appendix S	491 – 696.
Appendix T	697 – 700.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES:

PAGE:

* Tessema V. Environmental Protection Agency ----- 51 – 54 of Appendix G

1:20-cv-9700-MKV

* Scanlon V. Vermont, et al ----- 55 of Appendix G

10-4766-cv.

* Hakaniemi V. Zuckerberg ----- 57 – 58 of Appendix G

21-cv-4345-PKC-LB

* Jean – Baptiste V. Westside Donut Huntington Ventures LLC

-----59 – 61 of Appendix G

23-cv-2308-PKC-LB

* Alexander V. Program Development Service ----- 63 – 74 of Appendix G

1:18-cv-01433-BMC-RER

* Alexander V. Breaking Ground ----- 75 – 81 of Appendix G

1:20-cv-05114-BMC-RER

xiii
A

STATUTES

1. PL235-61stat.496,50 U.S.C.402
2. 63 stat.579;50 U.S.C.401 et seq
3. 61 Stat.495
4. 42-t-40845958-20081524F-012-005-2016
5. 42-t-40845958-20081524F-011-014-2016
6. 36 C.F.R.1254.62
7. Pub. L. No 94-553.90stat.2541
8. (15 U.S.C.1116(d)(2) through (11))
9. (15 U.S.C.1127) sec.106A (a); sec.602; sec.411, sec.111 and sec.501-513
10. 1 through 8 and 10 through 12 of Title 17 Chapter 5 U.S.C.
11. 28 U.S.C.-1915 (e)(2)(B) (Dkt (8))
12. 28 U.S.C.1915 (a)(3)

xiv
CA

RULES

- FED. R. CIV. P. 12 (b)(1)
- FED. R. CIV. P. 12 (b)(6)
- FED. R. CIV. P. 8 (a)
- FED. R. CIV. P. 27

OTHER

Receipt for production and mastering of the song "Feelings". (See page 701)

26 V
CA

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 at **Appendix A** to the petition and is.

☒ reported at Google: Alexander V. Gleeson; Citations: No.237565(2dCir.Jul.1,2024); 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 www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/uscourts-nyed-1_23-cv-05663/pdf/U.S.Courts-nyed-1_2...; Citation: case1:23-cv-05663-PKC-RER document4Filed; 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.

/
 CA

JURISDICTION

☒ For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was: **July 1st, 2024**.

☐ 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: **October 24th, 2024**, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at **page 11 of Appendix A**.

☒ An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including **December 31st, 2024** (date) on: **March 23rd, 2025**, (date) in **Application No. 24 A 647. (See pages 82 – 100 of Appendix H)**.

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 states court decided my case was _____.

A copy of that decision appears in the 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 an extraordinary writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. ____ A _____.

The jurisdiction of Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C.-1257(a).

2
0A

51

Search documents this case

Search

No 24A647

Title

Owen Marlon Alexander, Applicant
v.
Andreea Gleeson, et al

Docketed

December 31, 2024

Lower Ct

United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit

Case Numbers

(23-7565)

DATE	PROCEEDINGS AND ORDERS
Dec 23 2024	Application (24A647) to extend the time to file a petition for a writ of certiorari from January 22, 2025 to March 23, 2025, submitted to Justice Sotomayor. Main Document
Jan 13 2025	Application (24A647) granted by Justice Sotomayor extending the time to file until March 24, 2025

NAME	ADDRESS	PHONE
Attorneys for Petitioner		
Owen Marlon Alexander	P.O. Box 1049 New York, NY 10163	(347) 785-7015
Party name: Owen Marlon Alexander		

3
CA

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISION INVOLVED

- PL235-61-stat.496,50-U.S.C.- 402 of the National Security Act of 1947.

Unethical Human Experiment.

- 63 stat. 579;50U.S.C.401 et seq.

National Security Act of 1947 Amendments.

- 61 stat.495 (CIA info Collection).

The Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) was established effective September 18th,1947, in pursuant to the National Security Act, (61stat.495).

See pages: (419 – 518 of Appendix S.)

- 42-t-40845958-20081524F-012-005-2016

Human Cloning Act

See pages: (519 – 570 of Appendix S)

- 42-t-408-45958-20081524F-011-014-2016

Human Cloning: Cloning Human Beings; Report and Recommendations of the National Bioethics Advisory Commission; June 1997

See pages: See pages: (571 – 696 of Appendix S.)

- 36C.F.R.1254.62 NARA Regulation.

4
OR

National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) Title 17 of the United States Code, including all amendments enacted by Congress through December 23rd, 2022.

Includes the copyright of 1976 and all subsequent amendments to copyright law; the semiconductor chip protection Act of 1984, as amended; and the Vessel Hull Design protection Act, as amended.

The Copyright laws is contained in chapters 1 through 8 and 10 through 12 of Title 17 of the United States Code.

- Pub.L.No.94-55390stat.2541
- (15U.S.C.1116 (d)(2) through (11)) The Trademark Act
- (15U.S.C.1127- "Trademark Act of 1946")

Sec.106 A(a); Sec.602; Sec.411, Sec.111 and Sec.501-513

See pages: (463 – 490 of Appendix R.)

- 1 through 8 and 10 through 12 of Title 17 chapter 5 U.S.C. of the United States Code of the copyright laws.

See pages: (467 – 490 of Appendix R.)

- 28 U.S.C.-1915(e) (2) (B) (Dkt(8)) See pages 697 – 700 of Appendix T.
- 28 U.C.S.1915(a)(3) See pages: 697 – 700 of Appendix T.

5
OA

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

1. This case is considered a 3890 statutes-another suit that includes copyright infringements laws of the U.S.36C.F.R.62, National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) regulation to title 17 of the United States Code, which includes all the amendments, enacted by congress through December 23rd,2022, including the copyrights of 1976 and all subsequent amendments to the copyrights law; the semiconductor chip Protection Act of 1984, as amended; and the Vessel Hull Design Protection Act, as amended to copyright laws that is contained in chapter 1 through 8 and 10 through 12 of title 17 of the United States Code.
2. This case also includes Pub. L. No 94-553.90 stat.2541; (15 U.S.C.1116(d)(2) through (11)) of the Trademark Act of 1946, (15 U.S.C. 1127 of Trademark Act of 1946; sec.106A(a); sec.602; sec.411; sec. 111 and sec.501-513 of the entertainment industry federal laws. (See pages 436 – 490 of Appendix R.)
3. This case also includes unethical human experimentation, which includes PL 235-61stat.496; 50 U.S.C.402 of the National Security Act of 1947, Unethical Human Experiment Laws.
4. 63 stat.579; 50 U.S.C. 401 et-seq. National Security Act of 1947, amendments.
5. (61st.495) of the National Security Act of 1947, Unethical Human Experiment Laws. (See pages: 419 - 518 of Appendix S.)

6. 42-t-40845958-20081524F-012- 005-2016, of the Human Cloning Laws. (See pages: 519 – 570 of Appendix S.)

7. 42-t-40845958-20081524F-011-014-2016 of the Cloning Human Beings; Report and Recommendations of the National Bioethics Advisory Commission, June 1997. (See pages: 571 – 696 of Appendix S.)

8. This case also includes violations of civil and liberal rights laws, that arise from discrimination based on organized corruption, the weaponization of the judicial branch of government against the petitioner, the housing Real Estate industry, the mental, medical, and dental health industry, with the deliberate intention to embarrass, humiliate, emasculate, and even unalive the petitioner.

9. The petitioner race, sex, religious belief, civil liberties, and the petitioner equal opportunity constitutional rights have been violated because of the respondents mentioned in this complaint actions.

10. The petitioner filed a civil complaint to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York in July 2023.

11. Magistrate Judge Ramon E. Reyes, Jr, who also presided over two (2) complaint the petitioner submitted to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District previously,

Case # 1:18-cv-01433-BMC-RER.

Case # 1:20-cv-05114-BMC-RER.

And District Court Judge Pamela K. Chen of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York, presided over this complaint.

12. The complaint was filed as a motion for Leave to Proceed in Forma Pauperis originally, in pursuant of stat. 28 U.S.C.-1915.

13. The complaint was dismissed because the petitioner failed to comply with Rule 8(a) of the Federal Rules of the civil procedures Federal practices. (See pages: 12 – 19 of Appendix B.)

14. The petitioner was granted 30 days from the date of the memorandum and order to file an amended complaint, by district judge Pamela K. Chen, of the District Court for the Eastern District of New York.

15. In September 2023, the petitioner filed an amended complaint, and the amended complaint was dismissed as a frivolous action because, according to magistrate Reyes, Jr, and District Judge Pamela K. Chen, it lacks an arguable basis in law or fact.

16. This was the same statement verbatim, that Circuit Judges Dennis Jacobs, Robert A. Katzmann, and William J. Nardini, made in their decision in March 2021, of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in their decision of the Owen Marlon Alexander V. Breaking Ground case #20-3932. (See page: 33 of Appendix D.)

17. The complaints filed in July 2023, and in September 2023 are different complaints to the previous complaints the petitioner presented to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York.

18. The petitioner have reason to believe that because of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) involvement in this complaint and the fact that the petitioner is aware of PROJECT MK-ULTRA, BLUEBIRD, and ARTICHOKE tactics was, and to this day being used against the petitioner, are unethical, along with the possibility of respondent Camille Reyes, could be related to magistrate Reyes, Jr, of the District Court for the Eastern District of New York.

19. Respondent Andreea Gleeson could be related to District Judge John Gleeson, of the District Court for the Eastern District of New York, the petitioner's mother who is very abusive towards the petitioner, and it is important to note that the petitioner have no fun memories with the petition mother.

20. Archbishop Christophe Pierre, and the Roman Catholic Clergy involvement, along with their 2.8 million members in New York City alone, and another, religious group.

21. Not forgetting Deputy Chief Administrative Judge, (DCAJ), Deborah Kaplan, of the New York County Supreme Court Civil Team, as a respondent in this complaint, who have ties to the Russian Mafia through her late father, Burton Kaplan, a known member of the Russian Mafia organization crime syndicate in the 1970's, are some of the reasons the petitioner prays for a writ of certiorari.

22. Magistrate Reyes, Jr, and District Judge Pamela Chen made their decision based on the petitioner's previous complaints which was made incorrectly by the petitioner, due to misguided and misinformed information by the previous Federal

Pro-Se Legal Aid team, and outdated administrative practices and procedures which created a violation of Rule 8(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil procedures and practices of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York.

23. The petitioner decided to pay the administrative processing fee required to reopen this complaint and appeal magistrate Reyes, Jr, and District Judge Chen decision.

24. The complaint was moved to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and was processed as a paid complaint instead of an appeal in forma pauperis case.

25. The petitioner suspected administrative errors during the processing of the petitioner complaint to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York.

26. During the administrative processing of the petitioner's complaint to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, the petitioner was asked to notify all the parties involved in this complaint as part of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, procedure, and their practice.

27. Due to the virtue that this complaint was originally processed as an in forma pauperis complaint, and providing that District Judge Chen did not dismiss the complaint, it would have been the district court responsibility to notify the respondents in this complaint that they were being sued, and it is important to note that some of the respondents have relocated from their previous address.

28. The petitioner complied to the administrative rules of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, because the petitioner is not an attorney, and the

fact that the petitioner has faith in the judicial system, the petitioner saw this opportunity as a learning experience, however, the petitioner was not aware that the judges who presided over this complaint, and previous complaints, in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York, and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit were deliberately abusing their judicial authority against the petitioner.

29. It is imperative to note that the petitioner did not enter the DHS Super 8 shelter facility with any mental health issues.

30. However, as a result of some traumatic experiences in the DHS Super 8 shelter facility, the petitioner began exhibiting symptoms of Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), which the petitioner is doing his best to heal, by playing the acoustic guitar at specific healing frequencies, doing his best to be happy in every moment in life, even when the moment is not a pleasant moment, learning how to love himself (self-love) unconditionally, and by having little to no interaction with the administrative employees of the DHS Super 8 Shelter facility.

31. Keep in mind that the operators of the DHS Super 8 shelter facility also owns and operates mental health facilities, and the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), operated using front organizations, such as non-profit organizations that operated within the mental health field and religious organizations to conduct their experiments on their subjects during the MK-ULTRA era.

//
A

32. On or around October 30th, 2024, the petitioner filed a motion based on unethical behavior to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit against Circuit Judge Danny Chin, Richard J Sullivan, and Beth Robinson of the U.S. Appeals Court for the Second Circuit, based on their unethical judicial misconduct behavior. (See pages: 107 – 263, 264 – 271, 272 – 282, 272 – 282, 283 – 306, 307 – 316, 317 – 398, 399 – 401, 402 – 462 of Appendix J, K, L, M, N, O, P, and Appendix Q.)

33. According to Mrs. Dina Kurot, the Deputy Clerk at the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit Clerk office, the motion was filed incorrectly, and the petitioner was given the local instructions for complaints filed under the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act of 1980, 28 U.S.C.-351-364, along with the rules for Judicial-Conduct and Disability proceedings, and the necessary forms to file the judicial-conduct and judicial disability correctly.

34. The petitioner received a letter dated December 11th, 2024, acknowledging the judicial conduct complaints that the petitioner filed on or around November 25th, 2024, was received and filed with the referenced docket numbers, 02-24-90128jm, 02-24-90129-jm, and 02-24-90130jm. (See pages 399 – 401 of Appendix P.)

35. The petitioner also filed Judicial Conduct Complaints against Magistrate Judge Roman E. Reyes, Jr, District Judge Pamela K. Chen, and Brian M. Cogan, of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York, on or around December 9th, 2024, and on or around December 11th, 2024, received acknowledgement letters

with reference docket numbers, 02-24-90134-jm, 02-24-90136-jm, and 02-24-90137-jm. See pages: (399 – 401 of Appendix P.)

36. According to the information stated in the letters, the petitioner will be notified by letter once a decision has been filed.

37. The petitioner also filed a complaint of misconduct and disability against Deborah Kaplan, Deputy Chief Administrative Judge, (DCAJ) of the New York County Supreme Court Civil Team, and the complaint was returned to the petitioner, along with a letter stating that the judicial complaint procedure in the Second Circuit is only relevant to federal judges in Connecticut, New York, or Vermont, and the procedure cannot be used to file a complaint against a judge in the New York County Supreme Court, Civil Branch. (See pages: 402 – 460 of Appendix Q.)

38. In a conference call with Mrs. Dina Kurot, the Deputy Clerk at the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, informed the petitioner that as of February 14th, 2025, the Judicial Council of the Second Circuit governing complaints against judicial officers under 28 USC-351, have not decided, or concluded on the complaints the petitioner filed.

39. When the petitioner filed complaints of misconduct against the judges who presided over the petitioner complaint to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York, and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, the petitioner then realized that it is possible the judges of the U.S. District Court for

the Eastern District and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit could be covering up something regarding the petitioner complaint.

40. The petitioner prays for a writ of certiorari because the information presented in the appendix files of this complaint are extremely sensitive and the petitioner feels uncomfortable serving the respondents this information because of the sensitivity of the information, the unethical nature of the judges' behavior in this complaint, and fear of retaliation from the respondents involve in this complaint.

41. The petitioner is grateful to be given the opportunity to be of service to the United States Government on this level and pray that new laws will be written and enact to prevent this level of judicial misconduct from happening in the future.

REASON FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

42. It is imperative that the Supreme Court of the United States know how appreciative and grateful the petitioner is to have this opportunity to present this petition for a writ of certiorari to their judges.

43. The petitioner have read and fully understand Rule 10 of the U.S. Supreme Court rules, administrative practices, and procedures.

44. The petitioner is aware that a writ of certiorari is rarely granted when the asserted error consists of erroneous factual findings or the misapplication of a properly stated rule of law is applied.

45. However, the petitioner strongly believes that a writ of certiorari is warranted, and should be granted under these server circumstances because of District magistrate Judge Ramon E. Reyes, Jr, District Judge Pamela K. Chen of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York, Circuit Judge Richard J. Sullivan, Denny Chin, and Beth Robinson of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, judicial abuse of authority against the petitioner.

46. The physical, mental, spiritual, and emotional abuse the petitioner has survived as a result of a collaborated attempt to embarrassed, humiliate, and emasculate the petitioner by deliberately using tactics used in the MK-ULTRA unethetical human experiments, prevented the petitioner from doing his best to improve the quality of his life, and punished the petitioner for assisting others in improving the quality of their lives.

47. The petitioner has been residing at the DHS Super 8 shelter, operated by Acacia Network, who also own and operate mental health facilities, forever two (2) years, without any assistance from the administrative staff members.

48. New laws were created and implemented to aid the over populated homeless shelter system because of the migration of illegal immigrants arriving to New York City, and because of the petitioner is educated in real estate as a licensed a Real Estate Broker, and was employed in the mental health fields as a direct care professional by Program Development Services, INC., (PDS), the DHS Super 8 shelter administrative staff refused to assist the petitioner with housing and dismissed the proof the petitioner provided to the administrative staff, that the

petitioner was illegally evicted from the petition's low income housing apartment because they also do business with the petitioner previous landlord.

49. By using other individuals who resided at the DHS Super 8 shelter facility to trigger the petitioner, the petitioner began exhibiting symptoms of Insomnia and Post Traumatic Stress Syndrome (PTSD).

50. In December 2022, after the petitioner began having backpain as a result of sleeping on a bed with steel springs mattress, being verbal abused by the petitioner roommate at that time, and the DHS Super 8 operation staff doing bed checks at 11pm, 3am, and now 2am instead of 3am, it triggered the petitioner Insomnia.

51. The petitioner roommate at that time would take pictures of the petitioner by looking at the petitioner through the mirrors that were on the walls of the room and masturbate as the petitioner changed his clothing.

52. These are some of the triggers that created the petitioner Post Traumatic Stress Syndrome (PTSD) symptoms. Because of these traumatic experiences the petitioner sleeps on the floor to this day.

53. The bed provided by the DHS Super 8, Acacia Network operations department staff have blood stains on the mattress, and when the petitioner complained to the operations department staff about it, they did nothing about it. Another reason the petitioner sleeps on the floor and the petition for the writ of certiorari should be granted.

54. The petitioner witnessed other individuals going through similar situations and advocated for them on their behalf and they were transferred to proper housing, however, because the petitioner advocated for other roommates with mental, medical health, and drug issues, the administrative staff of Acacia Network retaliated by deliberately denying the petitioner personal physician medical opinions, recommendations, and his personal analysis of the petitioner physical and mental health condition. (See pages: 235 – 263 of Appendix J.)

55. By playing the acoustic guitar at specific healing frequencies, meditating, or praying, doing his best to eat healthily, interacting with other individuals that will influence the petitioner in a positive, healthy way, the petitioner is doing his best to heal from all the emotional trauma he has experienced.

56. However, it is difficult to do the petitioner's best to recover from the trauma the petitioner experiences while residing in such a toxic environment with the administrative staff at the DHS Super 8 homeless shelter facility constantly psychologically, spiritually, and emotionally manipulating the petitioner.

57. The petitioner learned while doing research on healing frequencies that some, if not all of these frequencies were banned by the United States government because of the Roman Catholic Church recommendations, however, providing that these frequencies are used correctly, under the supervision of a properly trained musician, physician, psychiatrist, or a mental health therapist, combined with, or incorporated into an individual's mental health therapy plan, may not only heal, it could also improve the quality of the individual life.

58. This speculation is also a recommendation based on the petitioner's individual experiences.

59. Dietary measures must, I repeat, must be implemented based on individual physical health with proper supervision, and these frequencies may heal a variety of illnesses, including Alzheimer's disease and other illnesses.

These healing frequencies are found naturally within the earth's atmosphere and could be used in a variety of ways for a variety of positive purposes, thus improving the quality of life around the world.

60. Keep in mind the petitioner is not a doctor; however, by studying music theory and quantum physics the petitioner discovered these healing frequencies, and something the petitioner calls PSYCOACOUSTICS, by playing the petitioner's acoustic guitar at specific healing frequencies.

61. By granting a writ of certiorari in this situation will send a message to the respondents and their associates that such unethical, abusive behavior will not be tolerated under no circumstances, and individuals must be held accountable for their actions because the petitioner is being held accountable for his actions in this situation, thus improving the quality of the petitioner life and the lives of others.

62. It is important to know that the petitioner has forgiven everyone involved in the petitioner's abuse without anyone apologizing to the petitioner, including the petitioner's mother, however, it is almost impossible to forget some of the traumatic experiences the petitioner survived.

63. These are some of the reasons why the petitioner prays for a writ of certiorari to be granted on the petitioner behalf, providing that it not only pleases the court, however, it will improve the quality of the petitioner life, the lives of other individuals, and the United State Supreme Court is willing and able to review the administrative ethical practices and procedures of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York, the United State Court of appeals for the Second Circuit judicial ethical authority and their ethical conduct with full transparency.

CONCLUSION

Because the petitioner filed complaints of judicial misconduct and disability to the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, under the Act of 1980, 28 U.S.C.-351-364, against Circuit Judges Beth Robinson, Richard J. Sullivan, and Denny Chin of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, District Magistrate Judge Ramon E. Reyes, Jr, District Judge Pamela K. Chen, and District Judge Brian M. Cogan, of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York, and Deputy Chief Administrative Judge (DCAJ), of the New York County Supreme Court Civil Team, Deborah Kaplan, the projection of the petitioner complaint to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit have changed.

While the rules of the U.S. Supreme Court have been amended and was adopted in December 2022, the rules of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York remain the same.

Knowing this fact inspires the petitioner to ask what the petitioner could do to improve the quality of life for the Citizens of the United States, and not what the United States could do for the petitioner.

In reflecting on the petitioner traumatic experiences, the petitioner survived, the most important lesson the petitioner learned is the act of gratitude.

The petitioner always believed that the United States of America was always a great country. However, the petitioner changed their prospective on life in general and realized that the problems and challenges they faced were the problems of other individuals, and so the petitioner decided to find solutions to the issues that is being projected onto the petitioner instead of arguing with individuals that created the problem the petitioner is faced with today.

If it pleases the United States Supreme Court, Judges, the petitioner prays that this conclusion should be looked at with an open mind so we may all learn from this experience and do our best to improve the quality of our life. Not only individuals, however, as human beings and humanity in general do our best to find solutions to the judicial unethical behavior the petitioner is experiencing now.

WHEREFOR, the petitioner prays that the United States Supreme Court, Judges, may enter judgement as follows providing that it pleases the court.

1. A full investigation into all the petitioner complaints to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York, and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, with full transparency of their findings.
2. A full investigation and review of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, administrative practices, and procedures, with full transparency of their findings.
3. Create, amend, adopt laws and rules that would prevent the abuse of the judicial authorities and administrative ethics both State and Federal judges and officers of the Court procedures and practices.
4. Awarding the petitioner to practice the Swazi Religion, or as the petitioner call it, "the sprit of Carnival, Caribbean music, and Nature.
5. Awarding the petitioner the ability to record, produce, and perform his musical recordings in 432Hz, 417Hz, 528Hz, 174Hz, 285Hz, 396Hz, 639Hz, 714Hz, 852Hz, and 963Hz, and other healing frequencies.
6. Awarding the petitioner the ability to collaborate with other musical artist producers, and players of musical instruments, with the ability to participate in benefit concerts for Charitable causes, and live touring throughout the United States and the world.
7. Awarding the petitioner to practice buying and selling Real Estate properties as a licensed Real Estate Broker, the petitioner owns a non-profit

organization and assists in creating a privatized enterprise with administrative resources.

8. Awarding the petitioner presidential protection, orders of protection against family members and former acquaintances, background checks on all individuals the petitioner intends to do business with, thus preventing the petitioner from getting involved with any affiliations of organized crime.
9. Awarding the petitioner disclosures making private meetings with the petitioner private, unannounced to the public that will prevent the petitioner from being sued, and all other lost benefits.
10. Ordering a public apology, to the petitioner from all the defendants mentioned in the petitioner complaint to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York.
11. Awarding the petitioner any, all additional statutory, and punitive damages available under New York State, and Federal law.
12. Awarding the petitioner emotional distress damages in the sum of \$30 Billion or tender in value of gold, silver, land/housing, and any other lawful legal tender that will be satisfied as compensation for the petitioner physical, spiritual, and emotional pain and suffering.
13. Awarding the petitioner \$30 Billion or tender in value of gold, silver, housing/land, and any other lawful legal tender that will be satisfied as

compensation for the petitioner loss of reputation, humiliation,
embarrassment, and the assassination of the petitioner character.

14. Granting such order and further relief as just and equitable.

15. The petitioner therefore respectfully pray that this court reverse the
judgement of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and the U.S.
District Court for the Eastern District of New York, with findings of facts in
favor of the petitioner.

16. In the alternative, the court should remand the complaint on a fair and
impartial basis on proper evidence and under the correct instructions as just
and proper, with full transparency of their findings.

17. The petition for the Writ of Certiorari should be granted.


Respectfully Submitted,


UCC1-207; UCC1-308.



Date: 3/1/2025

OWEN MARLON ALEXANDER




9/9/25

23
074