No. 25-329

In the Supreme Court of the United States

HAROLD JEAN-BAPTISTE,
Petitioner,

v.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, ET AL.,
Respondents.

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Harold Jean-Baptiste
253-37 148 Drive
Rosedale, NY 11422
(786) 657-8158
hbaptiste@influctec.com

Pro Se Petitioner

Fourth day of August, MMXXV

United States Commercial Printing Company • www.uscpc.us • (202) 866-8558

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

Can the Federal Government get away with attempted murder, terrorist acts, and Human Rights violations on an American Citizen and use the Federal Government's power to influence the Courts' decision to protect the Federal Bureau of Investigation from liability for committing a terrorist act?

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING

Petitioner, and plaintiff-appellant below, is Harold Jean-Baptiste.

Respondents, and defendants-appellees below, are the Department of Justice, Pam Bondi, in her official capacity as the U.S. Attorney General, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Kash Patel, in his official capacity as Director of the F.B.I., and the Civil Process Clerk for the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Southern District of Florida.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS

United States District Court (S.D. Fla.):

- *Harold Jean-Baptiste* v. *United States of America, et al.*, No. 24-cv-24646-JEM (Jan. 14, 2025) (order adopting report and recommendation to grant motion to dismiss)

United States Court of Appeals (11th Cir.):

- *Harold Jean-Baptiste* v. *United States Department of Justice, et al.*, No. 25-10218 (May 16, 2025) (opinion affirming district court decision)

- *Harold Jean-Baptiste* v. *United States Department of Justice, et al.*, No. 25-10218 (Jul. 3, 2025) (en banc rehearing denied)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Appendix

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Constitutional Provisions, Statutes, and Rules

(This page is intentionally left blank)

OPINIONS BELOW

The Eleventh Circuit's decisions are reproduced in the Appendix at App.1-10. The Southern District of Florida's decisions are reproduced in the Appendix at App.11-18.

JURISDICTION

The Eleventh Circuit's judgment was entered on May 15, 2025. The Eleventh Circuit denied rehearing on July 3, 2025. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

The constitutional provisions involved in this case are, first, Amendment I of the United States Constitution:

> Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

U.S.Const. Amend. I

Second, § 1 of Amendment XIV of the United States Constitution:

> All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the state wherein they reside. No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

U.S.Const. Amend. XIV § 1

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Jean-Baptiste filed a complaint in U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida individually on behalf of himself against the United States Department of Justice, et al., who discriminated against Jean-Baptiste, who was subjected to a Human Rights, Civil Rights violation, and attempted murder. The FBI purposely and willfully violated Jean-Baptiste's Civil Rights, and attempted to murder Jean-Baptiste for filing complaints with DOJ FBI Inspector General for exposing a white supremacy group within the FBI cruel criminal behaviors. The U.S. District Court for

the Southern District of Florida dismissed the lawsuit without merit, despite the respondent not appearing in Court and the respondents influence on the Courts to suppress justice and to prevent the exposure of the shameful acts done by the FBI.

Jean-Baptiste appealed to the Eleventh Circuit to overturn the district court's errors. However, the Eleventh Circuit affirmed the district court's ruling based on influence on the Courts. Jean-Baptiste prays that the Supreme Court overturn the Eleventh Circuit's errors, reinstate Jean-Baptiste's due process rights, and hold the FBI accountable. Most importantly, to maintain the integrity of the Judicial System and set a precedent to ensure that the rule of law matters, a fair Judicial process, and to prevent this from happening to someone else in the future. The Writ of Certiorari is before the Supreme Court on the merits that the Eleventh Circuit applied the law incorrectly, denied due process, First Amendment Right to Petition, unfair Judicial review, error, mistake, inexcusable neglect, and public interest. The Judicial Branch is the check and balance to government behavior, must be independent from government influence, and the Courts must stand firm and hold anyone accountable for violation of the law, even if it's a government institution. One set of rules of law applies to everyone before the Court. No statute backs the FBI to violate the law in the most cruel way possible and attempt to murder an American citizen at will. It's a *blasphemy of justice* that the most esteemed Judicial System in the world to not have the courage to impede the influence of the Federal Government because of the embarrassment the nature of the case

would bring to the FBI. Since biblical times, "*Evil is only afraid of shame*", Isaiah 54-4-8.

INTRODUCTION

The Eleventh Circuit's judgment was entered on May 30, 2025, the U.S. Court of Appeals affirmed the district court rulings based on the Respondents' influence on the Courts to protect a government institution from liability, human rights violation, and attempted murder. The complaint has overwhelming evidence of images, video and witnesses of the violations of the law that were very clear. Because of the nature of the case the Courts interference denied a fair hearing of the case, to prevent the case from going to trial. The Eleventh Circuit's ruling lack legal judgment and is clearly biased to protect the Federal Government. Jean-Baptiste files a petition for a Writ of Certiorari to correct the Eleventh Circuit's errors, based on Judicial interference and inexcusable neglect. This petition for a writ of certiorari is being filed to correct the Judicial bias of the Eleventh Circuit and the district court.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Jean-Baptiste contends that the Supreme Court should grant Writ of Certiorari to review the cases based on the inexcusable error of the Eleventh Circuit, which applied the law incorrectly, unfair Judicial review, denial of First Amendment Right to Petition, error, mistake and inexcusable neglect.

The Eleventh Circuit's decision on this case was flawed based on Judicial neglect and Respondents' influence on the Courts. Jean-Baptiste filed the lawsuit to seek justice and fair Judicial review, based on the oath of service taken by every Judge in the United States in all United States Courts. The Eleventh Circuit's denial of Jean-Baptiste's due process when proper jurisdiction exists is a grave injustice by the Eleventh Circuit. Regardless if Jean-Baptiste is "*Pro Se*", the First Amendment Right to Petition and a fair Judicial review should not be obstructed, and prays the Supreme Court grant a review and correct the improper application of the law and set a precedence the Petition is a human being and the Courts cannot protect a government institution from trying to end the life of an American Citizen, the Courts bias is a *blasphemy of justice.*

I. U.S. District Court Applied the Law Incorrectly

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit applied the law incorrectly by dismissing the case for frivolous reasons, when the case was appeal on under jurisdiction of 28 U.S.C. § 1291, 28 U.S.C. § 1292 and 28 U.S.C. § 1295. Even early in the Judicial System the Supreme Court stated, "one system of law in one portion of its territory and another system in another, provided it did not encroach upon the proper jurisdiction of the United States, nor abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws in the same district,

nor deprive him of his rights without due process of law", *see Maxwell* v. *Dow*, 176 U.S. 581, 598 (1900). The U.S. Court of Appeals should apply one system of law for every case present before the Court, U.S. Court of Appeals failure to recognized violation of law and the clear evidence of facts on this case, was an error of judgement and applied the law incorrectly based on Judicial influence from the Respondents because of the ugly nature of the case. "The Court has no authority to enact rules that "abridge, enlarge or modify any substantive right." *Ibid.* Pursuant to this authority, the Court promulgated the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to "govern the procedure in the United States district courts in all suits of a civil nature", *see Cooter Gell* v. *Hartmarx Corp.*, 496 U.S. 384, 391 (1990).

The Eleventh Circuit applied the law incorrectly; the proper ruling of the case falls within the U.S. Court of Appeals' jurisdiction, and obstructing the Court's jurisdiction constitutes an incorrect application of the law and a judicial error. The Supreme Court stated, "cases must be acknowledged to have diluted the absolute purity of the rule that Article III jurisdiction is always an antecedent question, none of them even approaches approval of a doctrine of "hypothetical jurisdiction" that enables a court to resolve contested questions of law", *see Steel Co.* v. *Citizens for Better Env't*, 523 U.S. 83, 101 (1998). The Supreme Court stated when "the District Court has jurisdiction of this cause. It was error to dismiss the complaint for lack of jurisdiction, *see Doud* v. *Hodge*, 350 U.S. 485, 487 (1956). The Supreme Court stated, "acting within its proper jurisdiction, has given the parties a full and fair

opportunity to litigate federal claims, and thereby has shown itself willing and able to protect federal rights", *see Allen* v. *McCurry*, 449 U.S. 90, 104 (1980). The Eleventh Circuit's error in ruling was not based on any facts but Judicial bias and violated Jean-Baptiste's fundamental rights to due process and a fair Judicial review. The Supreme Court stated, "traditional purpose of confining a district court to a lawful exercise of its jurisdiction or to compel it to exercise its proper jurisdiction", *see Will* v. *United States*, 389 U.S. 90, 95 n.2 (1967). The Supreme Court stated that even if such difficulties may not be insurmountable, vexing problems of Courts with proper jurisdiction of the law must be applied correctly, *see Foley Bros.* v. *Filardo*, 336 U.S. 281, 299 (1949). The Supreme Court stated, "That Judicial power, as we have seen, is the right to determine actual controversies arising between adverse litigants, duly instituted in courts of proper jurisdiction", *see Liberty Warehouse Co.* v. *Grannis*, 273 U.S. 70, 75 (1927). The Eleventh Circuit had proper jurisdiction and failed to apply the law accordingly, even though adequate jurisdiction for the law existed; that failure to apply the law correctly was a judicial error.

II. Denied First Amendment Right to Petition

The freedom of petition clause guarantees that Americans can petition the government, entity or individual to redress their grievances without fear of retribution or punishment. This was an important principle valued by the Founding Fathers, in orchestrating the laws that govern the Court. The freedom of petition clause played an important role in

the Civil Rights petition for every person in America. At the earliest occurrence in the Judicial System, the Court stated, "It is a right which the party can claim; and if he shows himself entitled to it on the facts in the record, there is no discretion in the Court to withhold it. A refusal is error — Judicial error — which this Court is bound to correct when the matter, as in this instance, is fairly before it. That the order asked for by Jean-Baptiste should have been granted, seems to us very clear", *see Railroad Company* v. *Soutter*, 69 U.S. 510, 522 (1864). A terrorist criminal syndicate white supremacy group within the FBI Agents collectively tried to end the life of an American Citizen as retaliation for exposing serious violations of the law and why in the world would the Courts not want to hold the Respondents accountable, the rational can only be two choices the Court is bias or Federal Government influence on the Courts, no other possible educated conclusion.

The Respondents do not want this terrorist act by this white supremacy group within the FBI to be exposed; hence, the Respondents' influence on the Courts to protect the FBI from liability and shame. It's a grave injustice where the Courts would want to deny Jean-Baptiste justice of such a gruesome terrorist act by the FBI. This can only mean how guilty the Respondents are, hence the motive to influence the Court's ruling. It's imperative that in a democratic society, or the experience of having a democracy, the Courts must be independent from the influence of the Federal government to suppress justice and to maintain the fabric of a Democratic society. The Department of Justice must not mean justice anymore, we should just say it, for an

institution of justice to impose influence on the Court to want to cover the ugliest act a person can do to someone, most importantly by an FBI Special Agent, is beyond an immoral act.

The Supreme Court must overturn the ruling of the Eleventh Circuit and state *"when was Jean-Baptiste not a human being"* that his life did not matter for justice, and the Courts lost faith in justice to shelter a terrorist crime committed on a Blackman in America, by the FBI. The Eleventh Circuit's ruling was sugar-coated, and what the ruling really said was *"the rule of justice to not applied to every America Citizen and some American Citizen's life is insignificant"*, based on the Eleventh Circuit's rulings the Petitioner has accepted this conclusion as fact. Past precedents of the Court stated, "We hold that such claims are properly analyzed under the Fourth Amendment's 'objective reasonableness' standard, rather than under a substantive due process standard", *see Graham* v. *Connor*, 490 U.S. 386, 388 (1989). Having the Right to Petition and due process is the guiding foundation of the Judicial System; to obstruct that would derail the guiding principles on which democracy is built. Past Courts stated, "we recognized that the right of access to the Courts is an aspect of the First Amendment Right to Petition", *see Bill Johnson's Restaurants, Inc.* v. *Nat'l Labor Relations Bd.*, 461 U.S. 731, 741 (1983). The obstruction of the Right to Petition by past Court stated, "The Right to Petition the Courts cannot be so handicapped", *see Railroad Trainmen* v. *Virginia Bar*, 377 U.S. 1, 7 (1964). "It must be underscored that this Court has recognized the "[r]ight to Petition as one of the most precious of the

liberties safeguarded by the Bill of Rights", *see Lozman* v. *City of Riviera Beach*, 138 S.Ct. 1945, 1954 (2018).

The Eleventh Circuit's ruling hindered Jean-Baptiste's right to due process before the Court, therefore depriving Jean-Baptiste of their First Amendment Right to Petition. Past Court stated, "to any original party or intervenor of right seeking relief from extraordinarily prejudicial interlocutory orders, including the right to appeal from a final judgment and the Right to Petition", *see Stringfellow* v. *Concerned Neighbors in Action*, 480 U.S. 370, 385 (1987). The Eleventh Circuit's impeding of Jean-Baptiste's Right to Petition is an abuse of the Judicial System guidelines for providing a fair Judicial review for a Jean-Baptiste; therefore, the Supreme Court should not allow this abuse of the Judicial System and set a precedent to correct it. According to past Court, "the right of access to the Courts, the Right to Petition is substantive rather than procedural and therefore cannot be obstructed, regardless of the procedural means applied", *see Franco* v. *Kelly*, 854 F.2d 584, 589 (CA2 1988).

Most importantly past Court stated, "The right of individuals to pursue legal redress for claims that have a reasonable basis in law or fact is protected by the First Amendment Right to Petition and the Fourteenth Amendment right to substantive due process", *see Snyder* v. *Nolen*, 380 F.3d 279, 291 (CA7 2004). Nothing in the First Amendment itself suggests that the First Amendment Right to Petition for redress of grievances only attaches when the petitioning takes a specific form, *see Pearson* v. *Welborn*, 471 F.3d 732, 741 (CA7 2006). It is by now

well established that access to the Courts is protected by the First Amendment Right to Petition for redress of grievances, *see Wilson* v. *Thompson*, 593 F.2d 1375, 1387 (CA5 1979). The Supreme Court held that "the First Amendment Right to Petition the government includes the right to file other civil actions in Court that have a reasonable basis in law or fact", *see Silva* v. *Vittorio*, 658 F.3d 1090, 1102 (CA9 2011). "Meaningful access to the Courts is a fundamental Constitutional Right, grounded in the First Amendment Right to Petition and the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendment due process clauses", *see Johnson* v. *Atkins*, 999 F.2d 99, 100 (CA5 1993). The Supreme Court has recognized "the Right to Petition as one of the most precious of the liberties safeguarded by the Bill of Rights", *see Lozman* v. *City of Riviera Beach*, 138 S.Ct. 1945 (2018).

The Supreme Court should look at the gravity of allegations and to deny a "*Pro Se*" Jean-Baptiste from having due process before the Court and the severity of the allegations by the Respondents and denying Jean-Baptiste's right to due process and implies the Respondents are above the law and can get away with trying to murder an American Citizen. The Supreme Court stated, "At its core, the right to due process reflects a fundamental value in our American constitutional system. Our understanding of that value is the basis upon which we have resolved", *see Boddie* v. *Connecticut*, 401 U.S. 371, 374 (1971). The Supreme Court should examine more precisely the weight of the First Amendment Right to Petition by the Constitution, the calamity of the Federal Laws violations presented by Jean-Baptiste,

who is filing "*Pro Se,*" and the opportunity to present the case before the Court to grant Jean-Baptiste's due process. First, the risk of an erroneous deprivation of the law since the Respondent never responded or gave notice of appearance to the U.S. Court of Appeals, therefore the Eleventh Circuit should have issued an order of default judgment since the respondent failed to respond in 30 days "after receiving a docketing notice from the circuit clerk" and no notice of appearance according to 11th Cir. R. Frac 4 (a)(1(a)). According to 2d Cir. L.A.R. 31.2(d), the U.S. Court of Appeals failed to enter judgment for the relief requested based on default judgment. Jean-Baptiste's fair due process was denied, and the concept of the Judicial System is to provide a fair Judicial review. *The Eleventh Circuit ruling was an error in denying Jean-Baptiste's right to fair due process, as it applied the law incorrectly and failed to ensure* fair due process.

III. Errors, Mistakes, and Inexcusable Neglect

The Eleventh Circuit ignored the rules of the Court and made an error in judgment by affirming the lower Court ruling, which was due to inexcusable neglect. The Eleventh Circuit clearly had jurisdiction to correct the U.S. District Court; not doing so was an unforgivable error and neglect. The errors, mistakes, and inexcusable neglect by the Eleventh Circuit denied Jean-Baptiste a fair Judicial review. In *United States* v. *Olano*, 507 U.S. 725 (1993), the Supreme Court established three conditions that must be met before a Court may consider exercising its discretion to correct the error. First, there must be

an error that has not been intentionally relinquished or abandoned. Second, the error must be plain-that is to say, precise, or unmistakable. Third, the error must have affected Jean-Baptiste's substantial rights. To satisfy this third condition, Jean-Baptiste ordinarily must show a reasonable probability that, but for the error, the outcome of the proceedings would have been different, as noted in *Cameron* v. *Seitz*, 38 F.3d 264 (1994).

The Eleventh Circuit actions were a clear error and affected the outcome of the Judicial proceeding. Prior Courts stated, "[r]emedies for Judicial error may be cumbersome but the injury flowing from an error generally is not irreparable, and orderly processes are imperative to the operation of the adversary system of justice", *see Maness* v. *Meyers*, 419 U.S. 449, 460 (1975). Prior Court have stated "the Court must view the evidence in a light most favorable to the party against whom the motion is made and give that party the benefit of all reasonable inferences", *see Cameron*, 38 F.3d 264 (1994). The Supreme Court stated, "[t]he equitable powers of Courts of law over their process to prevent abuse, oppression, and injustice are inherent and equally extensive and efficient, as is also their power to protect their jurisdiction. In whatever form, the remedy is administered, whether according to a procedure in equity or at law, the rights of the parties will be preserved and protected against Judicial error. The final decree or judgment will be reviewable, by appeal or writ of error, according to the nature of the case", *see Krippendorf* v. *Hyde*, 110 U.S. 276 (1884). "U.S. Const. amend. XIV does not guarantee due process, nor does it assure immunity

from Judicial error. It is only miscarriages of such gravity and magnitude that they cannot be expected to happen in an enlightened system of justice, or be tolerated by it if they do, that cause the Court to intervene to review, in the name of the federal constitution", *see Stein* v. *New York*, 346 U.S. 156 (1953).

The Supreme Court stated, "It is a right which the party can claim; and if he shows himself entitled to it on the facts in the record, there is no discretion in the Court to withhold it. A refusal is error–Judicial error–which this Court is bound to correct when the matter, as in this instance, is fairly before it", *see Milwaukie & M.R. Co.* v. *Soutter*, 69 U.S. 510 (1864). The Supreme Court stated, "That risk of unnecessary deprivation of liberty particularly undermines the fairness, integrity, or public reputation of Judicial proceedings in the context of a plain guidelines error because guideline's miscalculations ultimately result from Judicial error, as the District Court is charged in the first instance with ensuring the Guidelines range it considers is correct", *see Rosales-Mireles* v. *United States*, 138 S.Ct. (1897).

Prior Court stated, "The doctrine of stare decisis allows us to revisit an earlier decision where experience with its application reveals that it is unworkable," *see Payne* v. *Tennessee*, 501 U.S. 808, 827 (1991). The Eleventh Circuit's errors in the case are unworkable because the ruling was not applied to the rules and laws that govern the Court. Prior Court ruling on errors stated, "Experience is all the more instructive when the decision in question rejected a claim of unconstitutional vagueness. Unlike other Judicial mistakes that need correction,

the error of having rejected a vagueness challenge manifests itself precisely in subsequent Judicial decisions: 'a black hole of confusion and uncertainty' that frustrates any effort to impart "some sense of order and direction", *see United States* v. *Vann*, 660 F.3d 771, 787 (CA4 2011).

The Eleventh Circuit did not follow the law correctly; the Respondents' influence on the Court created a sense of confusion in the ruling. The Supreme Court can provide clarity on how the Court should follow the rule of law that governs the Judicial System and reverse the Eleventh Circuit's order, applying the law correctly. "It is a judge's duty to decide all cases within his jurisdiction that are brought before him. His errors may be corrected on appeal, but he should not have to fear that unsatisfied litigants may hound him with litigation", *see Forrester* v. *White*, 484 U.S. 219, 227 (1988). Prior Court have provided insights on evaluating Judicial neglect, "To determine whether any of a judge's actions were taken outside his Judicial capacity, the "nature of the act" is examined, *i.e.*, whether it is a function normally per- formed by a judge, and to the expectations of the parties, *i.e.*, whether they dealt with the judge in his Judicial capacity", *see Cameron* v. *Seitz*, 38 F.3d 264 (1994). The prior Court stated, "Judicial error, is the requirement that judges write opinions providing logical reasons for treating one situation differently from another", *see Arkansas Writers' Project, Inc.* v. *Ragland*, 481 U.S. 221, 235 (1987).

The Eleventh Circuit never provided any explanation or logical reasons for treating Jean-Baptiste differently when applying the rules that

govern the Court. Prior Court stated, "Rule 60(b)(1) "may be invoked for the correction of Judicial error, but only to rectify an obvious error of law, apparent on the record", *see United States* v. *City of New Orleans*, 947 F.Supp.2d 601, 624 (E.D. La. 2013). Past Court stated, "facially obvious" Judicial error in its decision and finds that the factual and legal conclusions in the court's order are "arguable." Therefore, relief is unavailable under Rule 60(b)(1)", *see Watson* v. *City of Kansas City, Kansas,* No. 99-cv-2106-CM, at *18 (D. Kan. Apr. 12, 2002). The Eleventh Circuit Judicial interference applied the law differently, made an error, and ignored the rules of the Court; therefore, it was inexcusable neglect by the Eleventh Circuit. The Eleventh Circuit's actions in the case were uncharacteristic of sound legal judgment, and it constitutes inexcusable neglect by the Eleventh Circuit, denying Jean-Baptiste a fair Judicial review. The Eleventh Circuit made a mistake, error and inexcusable neglect in applying the law correctly, by not issuing default judgment since the respondent did not appear before the U.S. Court of Appeals, and the ruling was an error without clear legal merit or respect for the rule of law that govern the U.S. Court of Appeals.

IV. Public Interest

It's in the public interest that the Supreme Court apply the law correctly as a result of the respondent failure to appear before the U.S. Court of Appeals or gave notice of appearance to the U.S. Court of Appeals therefore the rule of law must be applied accordingly based on the rules of the U.S.

Court of Appeals. According to the rules of the Court non-appearance in the U.S. Court of Appeals is subjected to default judgment or provide Jean-Baptiste a full fact-finding Judicial review. It's in public interest that the Supreme Court maintained the integrity of the Judicial System because the rule of law matters, and law-abiding straightforward rulings must always be considered when applying the law and to ensure that errors of the Eleventh Circuit are corrected and maintain Judicial equality. Respondents have a track record of guilt to try to end the life of Jean-Baptiste, the Respondents influence on the Courts is to hide that FBI Agents who took an oath to protect the law, violated the law in the worst way possible, by trying to end someone life and execute this *modern- day lynching*. The Respondents evil nature attempted to end the life of Jean-Baptiste as retaliation for filing Color of Law complaint with DOJ FBI Inspector General and violate the Plaintiff's Civil Rights, in the Supreme Court case No. 21-1175 immunity was confirmed by the Supreme Court, which is an *imputation of guilt* as stated by the Supreme Court, the Respondents can't gaslight the Supreme Court the FBI did not violate the law and got way with conspiracy to murder and attempted murder by agents of the law, the ultimate violation of the public trust.

The Supreme Court stated, "legislative immunity and a pardon. They are substantial. The latter carries an imputation of guilt; acceptance a confession of it.", *see Burdick* v. *United States*, 236 U.S. 79, 94 (1915). It's in the public interest that the Supreme Court set a precedence that the Courts must have independence from the Federal government in

ruling of any case and to reinstated the confidence in the Court to protect the public interest strong faith in an independent Judicial System, that the Court ruling is based on fact of the law, not Judicial bias base on Judicial influence by the government. The Supreme Court stated, "the balancing exercise in some other case might require us to make a somewhat more precise determination regarding the significance of the public interest and the historical importance of the events in question", *see Nat'l Archives & Records Admin.* v. *Favish*, 541 U.S. 157, 175 (2004).

It's in the public interest that the Supreme Court intervene in matters that would set a good precedence for the public interest to uphold the rule of law in the Judicial System independence from influence and that any errors of the lower Courts will be corrected by the Supreme Court and prevent Judicial bias or inexcusable neglect. It is not mere avoidance of a trial, but avoidance of a trial that would imperil a substantial public interest, that counts when asking whether an order is "effectively" unreviewable or hinder the public interest to prevent the similar allegations in this case, *see Will* v. *Hallock*, 546 U.S. 345, 353 (2006). When factors are profoundly serious violation of law by a party it's the Court duty to consider the effect of the public interest, in the public interest and should be construed liberally in furtherance of their purpose and, if possible, so as to avoid incongruous results, *see B.P. Steamboat Co.* v. *Norton*, 284 U.S. 408 (1932). In applying any reasonableness standard, including one of constitutional dimension, an argument that the public interest demands a particular rule must receive careful consideration, the effect of obliviousness to

factors that would protect the public interest would be a stain to the Court function in the society, *see Camara* v. *Municipal Court*, 387 U.S. 523, 533 (1967).

It's in the public interest that Supreme Court does not let Respondents influence on the Court hinder how the U.S. Court of Appeals rulings are made, or deteriorate what guiding principles the Judicial System stands for, that the Judicial System is the check in balance to Federal government activity and must be impartial for Federal government influence and all rulings are based on facts of the law and Judicial honor not to be bias. The Supreme Court must consider people never do things once, *how many other people have this criminal white supreme group within the FBI done this to and was successful, so sad to imagine.* According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) 2024, approximately 805,000 heart attacks occur in the United States each year, what percentage of those heart attacks could have been toxic substance given by this terrorist syndicate criminal white supreme group within the FBI, hurt my soul to visualize of this number. The Petitioner would have part of the heart attack statics, if God did not provide the Petitioner a sign to go to the hospital the number would been 805,000 + 1. The Petitioner is a human being, and the Supreme Court must reinstate that to the Respondents, the Petitioner's life matters just like theirs. When was the Plaintiff not a human being? The FBI does not have any law authorizing FBI Special Agents to attempt to murder an American Citizen. The Respondents has no defense on this topic; the only strategy is to pressure the Courts with its powerful influence to deny the truth and that horrible people within the FBI

attempted to end life of the Petitioner and it's in the public interest that all Courts rulings are independent of government influence and not have a *blasphemy of justice.*

CONCLUSION

Jean-Baptiste prays that a writ of certiorari be granted to correct the errors of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and not let the Federal Bureau of Investigation get away with a terrorist act and trying to end an American Citizen's life, and this *modern-day lynching*. When was Jean-Baptiste not a human being before the Court or all the stars in the Universe must have exploded in a supernova or burned out for the most esteemed Judicial System in the world to not hold the Respondents before the Courts accountable for violation of the law to execute the *modern-day lynching* and Human Rights violations in the worst way imaginable. Outside of Judicial interference and the Federal government's influence on the Courts to suppress justice and not reprimand the Respondents for attempts to end the life of an American Citizen is unconscionable to accept. The ruling of the Courts is clear: Jean-Baptiste must be a slave or not part of the human race for justice. These profound, serious claims in the Complaints are a travesty to the respondents and used all their power to influence the Courts to suppress justice and not honor justice or hold the Respondents accountable for this *modern-day lynching*.

The duty of the Courts in our society is to be non-biased, independent of government influence,

and hold Federal government institutions accountable regardless of the nature of the case, and no institution has the privilege or law backing them to try to end an American Citizen's life at will. The nature of the case is an insult to humanity, the Courts would not want justice to prevail in a society governed by laws that apply to everyone. Jean-Baptiste prays that the Supreme Court impose its independence and reject the Respondents' influence on the Courts, and respectfully asks the Supreme Court to hold the Respondents accountable to prevent this experience from happening to someone else in the future. *It's a travesty and a blasphemy of justice for the Courts not to honor their independence as the checks and balances to hold the Federal government accountable when it violates the law, and to uphold our most fundamental principle in a democratic republic: that every life matters and no one is above the law.*

This Court should grant certiorari.

Harold Jean-Baptiste
253-37 148 Drive
Rosedale, NY 11422
(786) 657-8158
hbaptiste@influctec.com

Dated: August 4, 2025 *Pro Se Petitioner*