

NO: 25-1152

**FILED**  
JUL 26 2025  
OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

In the Supreme Court of the United  
States

**ORIGINAL**

\_\_\_\_\_  
JONATHAN MORELAND, Petitioner

v.

WEST VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH et.

al., Respondent(s)

\_\_\_\_\_  
ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT COURT

\_\_\_\_\_  
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

-----  
Jonathan Moreland  
c/o: 35 Everlasting Lane  
Augusta, West Virginia [26704]

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

The United States District Court, District of West Virginia lacked lawful authority to require Petitioner to take a meningitis vaccine in order to attend school:

1. Who owns the physical body of Jonathan Moreland, Petitioner?
2. Did the lower courts violate petitioner's due process rights?
3. Can a CORPORATE MUNICIPAL (WEST VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH) officer order a person to take an injection against a medical doctor's recommendation?
4. Can a CORPORATE MUNICIPAL (WEST VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH) officer presume to have some right, title, or interest, in the physical body of Petitioner?

5. Does being a “minor” pursuant to Title 31 CFR 363.6 mean that petitioner gives up any right, title, or interest, in his physical body?
6. Does the United States Army, General of the Attorneys, aka United States Attorney General (or her minions: Bar members or administrative agents) get to maintain control over petitioner’s physical body (“container”) when operating as a “common-law trustee” pursuant to Title 50 USC 4312, para. 4?
7. Would the premises of the case of Ashwander v. Tennessee Valley Auth., 297 U.S. 288 (1936) mean that petitioner operates in a diminished capacity in relation to his physical body?
8. Is it true that Respondents as Public Trustees are operating upon the premise of “why not make every citizen a corporation sole, and thus bring them all into the Courts of the United States quo minus?”

Osborn v. Bank of the United States, 22 U.S. 738

(1824)?

## CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Petitioner operates in a diminished capacity as an adult "minor," United States citizen, pursuant to Title 31 CFR §363.6 with my estate held in trust with the "common-law trustee," aka "alien property custodian" dba United States Attorney General, so petitioner's estate domiciled in Washington District of Columbia. Petitioner retains trust estate grantor status and beneficial title, and naked owner to his "container," i.e. his physical body. UNITED STATES is a MUNICIPAL CORPORATION, District of Columbia v. Woodbury, 136 U.S. 450 (1890). "The municipal corporation called the District of Columbia, created by the Act of June 11, 1878, 18 Stat. 116, c. 337, is subject to the same liability for injuries to individuals arising from the negligence of its officers in maintaining in safe condition, for the use of the public, the streets, avenues, alleys and sidewalks of the City of

v

Washington, as was the District under the laws in force when the cause of action in *Barnes v. District of Columbia*, 91 U. S. 540 (1875), arose.”

vi  
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  
proceeding in the court whose judgment is the  
subject of this petition is as follows:

1.) Jonathan Moreland, Petitioner

2.) WEST VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH:

D/B/A: David A. Bishop

State Capitol Complex Building 6; Room 817-B

Central Location

Charleston West Virginia [25305]

3.) STEVEN COMPTON; [Deputy Attorney General]

812 Quarrier St 8th Floor

Charleston West Virginia [25301]

4.) JASON ROBERT TRAUTWEIN; [Asst. Attorney

General] 812 Quarrier St 6th Floor

Charleston West Virginia [25301]

5.) UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

& HUMAN SERVICES;

200 Independence Ave S.W.

Washington D.C. (20201]

6.) Dr. Ayne Amjad [Former MD for W.V.

Department of Health]

IN PRIVATE AND PERSONAL CAPACITY

330 N. Eisenhower

Beckley West Virginia (25801]

viii  
TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW.....	i-iii
CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT.....	iv, v
LIST OF PARTIES.....	vi, vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	viii-xiv
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	x-xiv
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI.....	2
OPINIONS.....	2
JURISDICTION.....	4
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED.....	4
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	5
FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....	6
PROCEEDINGS.....	7
1. ADMINISTRATIVE ADJUDICATION.....	7
2. STATE COURT PROCEEDINGS.....	8
3. UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT.....	8

4. COURT OF APPEALS, FOURTH CIRCUIT.....9  
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT.....10  
POINTS OF LAW AND FACT.....12  
MEDICAL CONSIDERATIONS.....25  
CONCLUSION.....35

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A:

Administrative Court.....App. 1

APPENDIX B:

State Court.....App. 4

APPENDIX C:

USDC Court.....App. 5

APPENDIX D:

Appellate Court.....App. 14

x  
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
Cases	
Afroyim v. Rusk, 387 U.S. 253 (1967).....	20
Allgeyer v Louisiana, 165 U.S. 578, 589 (1897).....	17
Ashwander v. TVA, 297 U.S. 288 (1936).....	18
Assoc. for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics, Inc., 569 U.S. 576 (2013).....	20
Barnes v. District of Columbia, 91 U. S. 540 (1875).....	v
Butchers' Union Co. v. Crescent City Co., 111 U.S. 746, 757 (1884).....	16
Byars v. U. S., 273 U.S. 28 (1927).....	23
Chevron U.S.A., Inc. v. NRDC, 467 U.S. 837 (1984).....	11
Coppage v. Kansas, 236 U.S. 1 (1915).....	16
Department of Agriculture Rural Development Rural Housing Service v. Kirtz, 601 U.S. 42 (2024).....	12

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES - Continued

District of Columbia v. Woodbury, 136 U.S. 450 (1890).....	iv
Downes v. Bidwell, 182 U.S. 244 (1901).....	23
Erie R. Co. v. Tompkins, 304 U.S. 64 (1938).....	18
Gaylor v. Reagan, 553 F. Supp. 356 (W.D. Wis. 1982).....	15
Jacobson v. Massachusetts, 197 U.S. 11 (1905).....	14
Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo, 603 U.S. 369 (2024).....	11
Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137 (1803).....	21
McGoldrick v. Berwind-White Co., 309 U.S. 33, 56- 58, 60 S.Ct. 388, 397, 398, 128 A.L.R. 876).....	22
Miller v. United States, 230 F.2d 486 (5th Cir. 1956).....	23
Murdock v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (Jones v. City of Opelika), 319 U.S. 105 (1943).....	22
NYSRPA v. Bruen, 597 U.S. 1 (2022).....	20

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES - Continued

Osborn v. Bank of the United States, 22 U.S. 738 (1824).....	iii
Perry v. United States, 294 U.S. 330 (1935).....	11
Pennsylvania v. Union Gas Co., 491 U. S. 1, 13, n. 4 (1989). [Page 8].....	12
Relentless Inc. v. U.S. Dep't of Commerce, No. 21- 1886 (1st Cir. 2023).....	12
Shapiro v. Thompson, 394 U.S. 618,.....	21
Stevens v. Berger, 428 Fed. Supp. 896 (1977).....	15
Stratton's Independence, Ltd. v. Howbert, 231 U.S. 399, 417 (1913).....	16
United States v. Bishop, 412 U.S. 346 (1973).....	23
United States v. Jackson, 390 U.S. 570, 581 (1968).....	22
U.S. v. Rhodes, 27 Federal Cases 785, 794.....	24

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES - Continued

## Statute and Code

Title 15 U.S. Code § 1.....	4
Title 28 USC §581 – United States trustees.....	18
Title 28 U.S.C. §§1346, 1441, 1442, and 1446.....	3, 8
Title 31 CFR §363.6.....	17, 19, 24
Title 50 USC §4312, para 4.....	17

## Acts of Congress

## District of Columbia, created by the Act of

June 11, 1878, 18 Stat. 116, c. 337.....	iv
Maternity Act of 1921.....	17
Sherman Antitrust Act.....	4, 24
P.L. 97-280.....	15, 19

## Constitutional Provisions

2 <sup>nd</sup> Amendment.....	19
5 <sup>th</sup> Amendment.....	2, 4, 14
7 <sup>th</sup> Amendment.....	12
13 <sup>th</sup> Amendment.....	15, 20

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES - Continued

14<sup>th</sup> Amendment.....24

The Equal Protection Clause.....4, 15, 22

Constitution for the united States of America  
(circa 1787).....10

Article 1, S10, Cl. 1,.....11

Article VI.C2.1,.....11

Constitutional Republic of the 1787.....18

1871 CORPORATE MUNICIPAL contract.....18

Treaties

Treaty of Peace of 1783.....11

Other Provisions

Law of Future Interest by Simes and Smith.....17

Title 16 Am Jur 2d Section 97.....23

In the Supreme Court of the United  
States

\_\_\_\_\_  
NO: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

JONATHAN MORELAND, Petitioner

v.

WEST VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH et.

al., Respondent(s)

\_\_\_\_\_  
ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT COURT

\_\_\_\_\_  
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
\_\_\_\_\_

JONATHAN MORELAND respectfully petitions for a writ of certiorari to review the judgment of the United States Court of appeals for the Fourth Circuit in this case.

### OPINIONS

The opinion of the WEST VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES BOARD OF REVIEW in administrative adjudication regarding trespass upon petitioner's (16 y/o) container, i.e. his physical body, is reported at 23-BOR-1047 and resulted in a denial of an immunization exemption request.

The opinion of the Hampshire County Court case no. CC-14-2024-C-9 (unpublished), for assault, violation of the Sherman Act, and 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment protection regarding trespass upon petitioner's container, i.e. his physical body resulted in a removal to the United States District Court for the Northern District of West

Virginia pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§1346, 1441, 1442, and 1446.

The opinion of the United States District Court for the Northern District of West Virginia case no. 3:24-cv-00030 regarding trespass upon petitioner's container, i.e. his physical body was dismissed in violation of established law.

The opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit regarding trespass upon petitioner's container, i.e. his physical body, is reported at USCA4 Appeal: 24-2179. The district court's orders denied petitioner's complaint and motions for judgment as a matter of law and fact.

## JURISDICTION

The case is docketed in the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit as Cause No. USCA4 Appeal: 24-2179 and was decided on April 28, 2025, before Nwamaka Anowi, Circuit Court Clerk. [See Exhibit "D"]

## CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY

### PROVISIONS INVOLVED

1. The Equal Protection Clause of Section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment
2. 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment
3. Title 15 U.S. Code § 1 (the Sherman Antitrust Act)

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Petitioner requests this Court exercise its power and discretion under Rule 14.1(e) of its rules to grant a Writ of Certiorari after judgment to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, which has entered judgment on an appeal of this case. The case presents questions about bodily autonomy, title to one's body, what goes into it, and what powers and authorities Public Trustees have over that physical body.

Respondents attempted to require Petitioner to take an injection called a "vaccine" for the alleged purpose of protecting petitioner against the meningococcal virus in order to attend public school. The State Health Officer, now governor, Patrick James Morrissey, (now governor against the forced mandates) denied the exemption. No valid reason was ever provided.

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The older brother of petitioner suffers from autism.

The family and his doctors believe the cause of petitioner's older brother's autism is the child health vaccination schedule requirements.

Petitioner was attending public school in West Virginia and

The family doctor, on or about August 29, 2022, Dr. Alieta Eck, MD, Board certified, Internal Medicine of AFFORDABLE HEALTH, INC. issued an exemption letter against the meningitis vaccine as it "includes aluminum, a neurotoxin; formaldehyde, a carcinogen, and polysorbate 80, which can cause infertility."

7  
PROCEEDINGS

1. ADMINISTRATIVE ADJUDICATION

Administrative adjudication was performed by and through the WEST VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN RESOURCES BOARD OF REVIEW, case no. 23-BOR-1047.

During the administrative adjudication period, January 3, 2023, the family doctor, Alvin H. Moss, MD wrote a letter on the matter directed to Ayne Amjad, MD, MPH, Commissioner and State Health Officer, basically restating the position of Dr. Eck and expressed the concern that the older brother's autism was possibly caused by "all the [childhood] vaccines."

The finding and outcome of that case was that "The above-styled matter is an appeal of the denial of an immunization exemption request by the Appellants for their child, J.M. On April 5, 2023, J.M. turned 18-years old, and therefore is no longer the minor child of

the Appellants.” Said finding and dismissal occurred June 16<sup>th</sup>, 2023, by ALJ, David A. Bishop.

## 2. STATE COURT PROCEEDINGS

Once administrative adjudication was completed petitioner brought suit into the CIRCUIT COURT OF HAMPSHIRE COUNTY, WEST VIRGINIA, case no. CC-14-2024-C-9. The respondents are those named in this case.

## 3. UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

That case was removed to the IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA, case no. 3:24-cv-30, on or about March 6, 2024, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1346, 1441, 1442, and 1446, because the United States Department of Health and Human Services was a named defendant in the state case. On October 23, 2024, the USDC court by and through GINA M. GROH, U.S. District Judge, issued her ORDER

GRANTING THE DEFENDANTS' MOTIONS TO  
DISMISS.

4. COURT OF APPEALS, FOURTH CIRCUIT

Petitioner timely appealed to the UNITED STATES  
COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH  
CIRCUIT, case no. 24-2179. On April 28, 2025, the  
Clerk of Court, NWAMAKA ANOWI, issued  
JUDGMENT affirming the USDC Court dismissal.

## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

This Court Should Exercise Its Power to Grant

Review Before Judgment.

For several reasons, the circumstances of this case make it appropriate for granting Petitioner's request for remanding the case back to the UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT for a ruling in favor or petitioner for the claims stated.

First, the case presents issues of fundamental importance. It concerns important constitutional and civil rights, and the resolution of these issues will almost certainly have effects that extend far beyond the parties to the case.

Second, this Court knows, It is the court's responsibility to protect the unalienable rights of petitioner and his "container" as without that fundamental liberty interest all other rights are irrelevant. If the Constitution for the united States of

America (circa 1787) is to remain “. . .the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby. . .” Article VI.C2.1, then the U.S. Const. Contract Clause found at A1, S10, Cl. 1, needs to remain intact as well.

If We The People, Constitutional Grantor/Beneficiaries are to remain “free, sovereign and independent,” Treaty of Peace of 1783, and maintain the fact that “sovereignty remains in the people.” *Perry v. United States*, 294 U.S. 330 (1935), then we, petitioner, must be allowed to maintain total and complete control over our “containers” aka physical bodies against undue infringement by the Constitutional and Administrative PUBLIC Trustees. This court ruled in overturning the Chevron doctrine (*Chevron U.S.A., Inc. v. NRDC*, 467 U.S. 837 (1984)) last year, 2024, in *Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo*, 603 U.S. 369 (2024) and its companion case

of *Relentless Inc. v. U.S. Dep't of Commerce*, No. 21-1886 (1st Cir. 2023), that said administrative courts cannot violate the 7<sup>th</sup> Amendment and that PUBLIC Trustees aka government agents are liable, *Department of Agriculture Rural Development Rural Housing Service v. Kirtz*, 601 U.S. 42 (2024), and waive sovereign immunity, “holding that” “the Court has held that sovereign immunity may be waived even without a separate waiver provision” and that “If no magic words are required’ to waive sovereign immunity, then the clarity of ‘each statute must be evaluated on its own terms.’ *Pennsylvania v. Union Gas Co.*, 491 U. S. 1, 13, n. 4 (1989). [Page 8]”

#### POINTS OF LAW AND FACT

According to a retired three star U.S. Navy Admiral, personal knowledge of this writer, the vaccination at issue is unnecessary except under VERY specific conditions and to make it worse, there is a problem as

the vaccine batches vary as to quality, content, need, effectiveness, and application. Requiring the shot may be a violation of the standards of care and may constitute malpractice. Therefore, even on a U.S. military application it is used sparingly for operational readiness.

This potential damage constitutes a "clear and present danger" to petitioner's health to allow for a Constitutional Public Trustee (Administrative Agent) in violation of Loper, supra, to require a Constitutional Grantor/Beneficiary to be required to take an injection mandated like something out of a Soviet era Communist Party International dictatorship. Mandating ANY INJECTION by the Constitutional Public Trustees would assume that said Public Trustees have some sort of right, title or interest, in the "container" physical body of petitioner. A constitutional law professor in the 1990s known as

Bill Medina in California used to walk into court with a button on his suit lapel that read "Who owns me?" That is the fundamental issue at bar before this court in this case.

Even under the (now very public case of) Jacobson v. Massachusetts, 197 U.S. 11 (1905), the worst that an CDC agency could do other than fining someone for failing to take a vaccination DURING AN EMERGENCY is mandatory quarantine for 14 days.

In this case there was no pandemic like the massive covid fraud. No quarantine was required, recommended, or even suggested, as the meningitis vaccine is entirely voluntary as no danger existed.

The law is clear under the 5th Amendment "No person shall. . . be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation."

The Equal Protection Clause of Section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment provides that no State shall "deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the Laws."

It could be argued that in addition to the previous stated provisions, forcing someone to take such an injection against their freewill would be a violation of the 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment for involuntary servitude. Such injections affect the human body, i.e. the container. Petitioner is a religious man and believes that he is an immortal spiritual being having a cosmic physical experience on this planet for reasons only known to his creator, Biblical references notwithstanding, P.L. 97-280, *Gaylor v. Reagan*, 553 F. Supp. 356 (W.D. Wis. 1982). This is a 1<sup>st</sup> Amendment issue, right to freedom of religion, *Stevens v. Berger*, 428 Fed. Supp. 896 (1977). A "Religious belief can appear preposterous to every other member of human race yet merit

protections of the Bill of Rights, USCA Const. Amend.

1.”.

Therein, his ability to labor would be affected as has his brothers, now handicapped. Also, keep in mind that Petitioner herein must knowingly be involved in any franchise or privilege of the FEDERAL/STATE government, which was legitimately subject to excise taxation, because his property (labor) derived from property considered by itself as not taxable pursuant to the holding in Stratton's Independence, Ltd. v. Howbert, 231 U.S. 399, 417 (1913). Therefore, this is also a jurisdictional issue.

Labor is property per the holding of Butchers's Union Co. v. Crescent City Co., 111 U.S. 746, 757 (1884). This fundamental right to property combines with the right to contract, including the right to contract for services in exchange for the sale of labor, pursuant to the holdings of Coppage v. Kansas, 236 U.S. 1 (1915); and

Allgeyer v Louisiana, 165 U.S. 578, 589 (1897). All of these cases are current Public Policy. Affiant owns that labor, see Maternity Act of 1921, a deposit, Law of Future Interest by Simes and Smith.

At the time of the original events Petitioner was 16 years old. i.e. a minor. Petitioner is now an adult "minor" pursuant to Title 31 CFR §363.6 with his estate held in trust with the "common-law trustee" dba "alien property custodian" aka United States Attorney General, Title 50 USC §4312, para 4. Therein, Respondents have a "known legal duty" to protect the Unalienable Rights of petitioner. It is an important distinction between unalienable rights and Biblical duties of the Constitutional Grantor/Beneficiaries and the Constitutional rights and contractual duties of the Public Trustees. This is where the Public Trustee DUTIES originate.

To date although petitioner is a sovereign, Perry, supra, he is currently operating in a diminished capacity by allowing the "common-law trustee" to maintain "legal title" control in the nature of Title 28 USC §581 – United States trustees. This is where the premises of *Ashwander v. TVA*, 297 U.S. 288 (1936), come into play, "One who thus accepts the benefits of a statute is estopped to assert that it is valid." The case of *Erie R. Co. v. Tompkins*, 304 U.S. 64 (1938), flipped the presumption of operating within the Constitutional Republic of the 1787 Constitutional contract versus the 1871 CORPORATE MUNICIPAL contract, Woodbury, supra. It now begs the question for this 18 year old whether he should revoke "Legal Title" away from the "common-law trustee" and her minions (Pam Bondi, current office holder) and revest it back to petitioner thereby merging (merger rule, Restatement of the Law, 2<sup>nd</sup>, Trusts) "Legal" and

“Equitable” title to collapse the presumption as it may have become a “breach of domestic tranquility” to the existing CORPORATE MUNICIPAL governmental trust relationship.

STANDING becomes an issue whether petitioner is operating as an adult “minor” (Title 31 CFR §363.6) or reverts title and makes claim to his securities held by the “custodian” at the U.S. Treasury (Title 31 CFR §363.6, “account” defined) and becomes a “Secured Party” creditor (SPC) in relation to his banker, the U.S. Treasury Secretary, Scott Bessent, current office holder.

In Osborn, supra, it demonstrates the perils of a sovereign operating in a diminished capacity. If this petition is ignored

as so many have been regarding jurisdictional issues should petitioner be forced to rely upon the Biblical “Esther” option (P.L. 97-280) 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment as ruled

upon in *NYSRPA v. Bruen*, 597 U.S. 1 (2022) against danger Public Trustees running about with syringes? Although this particular vaccination may or may not alter one's DNA the case of *Assoc. for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics, Inc.*, 569 U.S. 576 (2013) was very clear that the vaccine patent holder owns the "container" as it now contains patented biological property. Thus enters the 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment violations without a "packet insert" and full disclosure of the vaccination issuer over at "Big Pharma."

This then also raises the fact that citizenship is a personal property right pursuant to the finding in *Afroyim v. Rusk*, 387 U.S. 253 (1967), whereby "Congress has no power under the Constitution to divest a person of his United States citizenship absent his voluntary renunciation thereof. *Perez v. Brownell*, supra, overruled. Pp. 256-268." Therein, citizenship is a "personal property" right. Is Petitioner supposed to

discharge every commercial paper liability on the planet, get international recognition of Private International Sovereign status and file with the International Court of Justice to obtain relief? The founders were pretty clear in the Declaration of independence where they stated for the protection of "life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness." That last one has been found by this court to mean property. The most fundamental property belonging to petitioner is his "container" i.e. his physical body.

Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137 (1803), that that anything in conflict with the supreme law of the land is null and void of law, "An act of congress repugnant to the constitution is not law.", "When the constitution and an act of congress are in conflict, the constitution must govern the case to which both apply."

In Shapiro v. Thompson, 394 U.S. 618, it was stated that rules set forth by a state or federal legislative

body that restrict constitutional rights are patently unconstitutional, "Congress may not authorize the States to violate the Equal Protection Clause.", "If a law has 'no other purpose . . . than to chill the assertion of constitutional rights by penalizing those who choose to exercise them, then it [is] patently unconstitutional.' *United States v. Jackson*, 390 U.S. 570, 581 (1968)."

In *Murdock v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania* (*Jones v. City of Opelika*), 319 U.S. 105 (1943), the finding was that "no state may convert a secured liberty into a privilege.", "A state may not impose a charge for the enjoyment of a right granted by the federal constitution. Thus, it may not exact a license tax for the privilege of carrying on interstate commerce (*McGoldrick v. Berwind-White Co.*, 309 U.S. 33, 56-58, 60 S.Ct. 388, 397, 398, 128 A.L.R. 876), although it may tax the property used in, or the income derived

from, that commerce, so long as those taxes are not discriminatory.”

United States v. Bishop, 412 U.S. 346 (1973) and Miller v. United States, 230 F2nd 486, defines willfulness as "with evil motive or bad purpose either to disobey or to disregard the law."

In regard to how a right shall be interpreted, Title 16 Am Jur 2d Section 97 states "it shall be interpreted in my favor because I am the clearly intended and expressly designated beneficiary whose citizens were for the protected actions, rights and property," Byars v. U. S., 273 U.S. 28 (1927).

Supreme Court Justice Marshall Harlan ruled in Downes v. Bidwell, 182 U.S. 244 (1901) when he gave the following dissenting opinion: "Two national governments exist; one to be maintained under the Constitution, with all its restrictions; the other to be maintained by Congress outside and independently of

with foreign nations, is declared to be illegal. Every person who shall make any contract or engage in any combination or conspiracy hereby declared to be illegal shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and, on conviction thereof, shall be punished by fine not exceeding \$100,000,000 if a corporation, or, if any other person, \$1,000,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding 10 years, or by both said punishments, in the discretion of the court.”

Respondent WEST VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH is a MUNICIPAL CORPORATION violated petitioner's rights.

#### MEDICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Jonathan Moreland was a minor child when the first filing was made. The West Virginia Department of Health and /or the West Virginia Public school knew or should have known that the Vaccine had no proof of

working; nor less was an experimental drug and denied petitioner's filing exemption.

**MENINGITIS VACCINE:** This vaccine is contraindicated for the name because it contains the chemical compound, Diphtheria Toxoid. As an ingredient, it is a carrier protein for polysaccharides and haptens to make them immunogenic. The toxicity of Diphtheria Toxoid (CRM197) can cause damage to yeast cells and some mammalian cell lines. Haptens are small molecules that elicit an immune response when attached to a large carrier such as a protein; and they activate responses involving inflammatory cytokines. Examples of post market side adverse effects, associated with this vaccine include (not limited too)-Blood and Lymphatic System Disorders, Lymphadenopathy, Immune System Disorders, Hypersensitivity reactions such as anaphylaxis/ anaphylactic reaction, wheezing, difficulty breathing,

upper airway swelling, urticaria, erythema, pruritus, and hypotension. This presents a clear medical danger to name because these toxins would be exacerbated by the introduction of this substance to petitioner's body.

Supporting studies/evidence: Neisseria meningitidis group a capsular polysaccharide diphtheria toxoid conjugate antigen, Neisseria meningitidis group c capsular polysaccharide diphtheria toxoid conjugate antigen, Neisseria meningitidis group y capsular polysaccharide diphtheria Toxoid conjugate antigen, and Neisseria meningitidis group w-135 capsular polysaccharide diphtheria toxoid conjugate antigen injection, solution

[https://dailymed.nlm.nih.gov/dailymed/drugInfo.cfm?setid=4d8781f1-9366-462c-](https://dailymed.nlm.nih.gov/dailymed/drugInfo.cfm?setid=4d8781f1-9366-462c-6e958f44fcb4&audience=consumer-S11)

[6e958f44fcb4&audience=consumer-S11](https://dailymed.nlm.nih.gov/dailymed/drugInfo.cfm?setid=4d8781f1-9366-462c-6e958f44fcb4&audience=consumer-S11) Menactra, Meningococcal (Groups A, C, Y and W-135) Polysaccharide Diphtheria Toxid Conjugate Vaccine.

<https://www.vaccineshoppe.com/assets/pdf/vsh/pi/menactrapirapi.pdf>

Menactra (Meningococcal (Groups A, C, Y and W-135) Polysaccharide Diphtheria Toxoid Conjugate Vaccine) is a capsular polysaccharide diphtheria toxoid conjugate antigen, Neisseria meningitidis group c capsular polysaccharide diphtheria toxoid conjugate antigen, Neisseria meningitidis group y capsular polysaccharide diphtheria Toxoid conjugate antigen, and Neisseria meningitidis group w-135 capsular polysaccharide diphtheria toxoid conjugate antigen injection, solution

<https://dailymed.nlm.nih.gov/dailymed/drugInfo.cfm?setid=4d8781f1-9366-462c-6e958f44fcb4&audience=consumer-S11>

Menactra, Meningococcal (Groups A, C, Y and W-135) Polysaccharide Diphtheria Toxoid Conjugate Vaccine.

<https://www.vaccineshoppe.com/assets/pdf/vsh/pi/menactrapirapi.pdf>

## MENINGOCOCCAL SEROGROUP B

VACCINATION: This vaccine is contraindicated for name because it contains an ingredient, Fc gamma receptor and transporter (FCGRT). This gene encodes a receptor that binds immunoglobulin G; and also binds immunoglobulin G to protect the antibody from degradation. Due to alternative splicing caused by interaction with various ingredients in the vaccine, multiple transcript variant can occur, and trigger autoimmune reactions. Disease associated with FCGRT is Myasthenia gravis. Myasthenia gravis (MG) is a chronic autoimmune disorder in which antibodies destroy the communication between nerves and muscle, resulting in weakness of the skeletal muscles. Myasthenia gravis affects the voluntary muscles of the body, especially those that control the eyes, mouth, throat, and limbs. The disease can strike anyone at any age. A myasthenia gravis crisis can

involve difficulty in swallowing or breathing. The cause of myasthenia gravis is unknown and there is no cure. \*The encoded protein transfers immunoglobulin G antibodies from mother to fetus across the placenta. This presents a clear medical danger to name because these toxins would be exacerbated by introduction of his/her body.

Meningococcal group B vaccine Side Effects

[https://www.drugs.com/sfx/meningococcal-group-b-](https://www.drugs.com/sfx/meningococcal-group-b-vaccine-side-effects.html)

[vaccine-side-effects.html](https://www.drugs.com/sfx/meningococcal-group-b-vaccine-side-effects.html) Post Marketing ADVERSE

EFFECTS - Menactra, Meningococcal (Groups A, C, Y and W-135) Polysaccharide Diphtheria Toxoid

Conjugate Vaccine. \* Blood and Lymphatic

System Disorders Lymphadenopathy \*Immune

System Disorders \*Hypersensitivity reactions such as

anaphylaxis/anaphylactic reaction, wheezing,

difficulty breathing, upper airway swelling, urticaria,

erythema, pruritus, hypotension \*Nervous System

Disorders \*Guillain-Bar syndrome, paresthesia, vasovagal syncope, dizziness, convulsion, facial palsy, acute disseminated •encephalomyelitis, transverse myelitis\* Musculoskeletal and Connective Tissue Disorders Myalgia \* General Disorders and Administrative Site Conditions

\* Large injection site reactions, extensive swelling of the injected limb (may be associated with erythema, warmth, tenderness or pain at the injection site). Menactra •, Meningococcal (Groups A, C, Y and W-135) Polysaccharide Diphtheria Toxoid Conjugate Vaccine

<https://www.vaccineshoppe.com/assets/pdf/vsh/pi/menactrapi.pdf> Adverse effects

\*Diphtheria toxin currently used as a carrier protein for polysaccharides and haptens to make them immunogenic. There is some dispute about the toxicity of CRM197, with evidence that it is toxic to yeast cells

and some mammalian cell lines.[3]

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/CRM197>

\*Haptens

Are small molecules that elicit an immune response only when attached to a large carrier such as a protein

Haptens Initially activate innate immune responses by complex mechanisms involving inflammatory cytokines, damage-associated molecular patterns (DAMP), or the inflammasome.

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hapten>

\*Diphtheria Toxin Binds to the Epidermal Growth Factor (EGF)-like Domain of Human Heparin-binding EGF-like Growth Factor/Diphtheria Toxin Receptor and Inhibits Specifically Its Mitogenic Activity(•)

[https://www.jbc.org/article/S0021-9258\(18\)82959-](https://www.jbc.org/article/S0021-9258(18)82959-3/fulltext)

[3/fulltext](https://www.jbc.org/article/S0021-9258(18)82959-3/fulltext) \*Neisseria meningitidis - chemical compound summary

[https://pubchem.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/compound/Neisseria](https://pubchem.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/compound/Neisseria-meningitidis)

[a-meningitidis](#) FDA National Drug Code Directory:

\*This is not FDA approved 0268-67101965-01-01

INJECTION, SOLUTION .05 g/mL ALK-Abello, Inc.

Product ndc": "0268-6710", generic name": "Chinese

Elm" - brand name": "ULMUS PUMILA POLLEN"

<https://api.fda.gov/drug/ndc.json?search=product%20>

[ndc:%220268-6710%22](#)

\*WARNING This product is intended for use by physicians who are experienced in the administration of allergenic extracts and the emergency care of anaphylaxis, or for use under the guidance of an allergy specialist. As with all allergenic extracts, severe systemic reactions may occur. In certain individuals these life-threatening reactions may result in death. Fatalities associated with skin testing have been reported. Patients should be observed for at least 20 - 30 minutes following testing. Emergency

measures and adequately trained personnel should be immediately available in the event of a life-threatening reaction. Patients with unstable asthma or steroid dependent asthmatics and patients with underlying cardiovascular disease are at greater risk to a fatal outcome from a systemic allergic reaction.

It is a crime to use economic coercion, losing one's economic livelihood, education i.e., their job, for failing to take an "injection" when long-term damage may result. It is a crime to coerce someone into being subjected to taking an injection for an alleged disease, even absurdly, "the boogie-man", when it comes to a risk of less than 1% for death ... if it does not work and may even possibly cause an insertion of unknown elements into one's head where the brain is located. Testing even once under such coercion (economic, political, societal, legal, etc.) is a problem. Injection(s) testing constitutes cruel and unusual punishment

under the 8th Amendment, even if it were legal to do so, which it is not. There is no other property right more sacred than one's bodily integrity. Notwithstanding any other law, an establishment, as defined in subdivision (b), shall require each person who is eligible to receive the injection and show proof to a school; employee or authorized agent of the establishment that the person has been vaccinated against Parent(s) religious beliefs.

#### CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,



Jonathan Moreland

This document was prepared by:  
Shawn T. Rice, J.D. (Fed. Tr. Cir. Ct. #86082)  
Private International Sov#3773700, Den Haag  
Shawn Rice and Associates  
c/o: 28039 Scott Road, Unit D-350  
Murrieta, California [92563]

July 2025